DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 059 LI 004 298

AUTHOR Haas, Joyce H.; Kreamer, Katherine A.
TITLE Narrative Evaluation Report on the Institute for Training in Librarianship: The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society: Cross-Cultural Training for Social Action (Univ. of Hawaii, Honolulu; Aug. 1971-May 1972).
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Honolulu. Graduate School of Library Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 113p.; (0 References)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Groups; Experimental Programs; *Librarians; *Library Education; *Library Services; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Librarianship; University of Hawaii

ABSTRACT

The Institute involved thirty-one participants (twenty-one working librarians and ten students) in a two-semester program, beginning in August, 1971 and ending in May, 1972. The program consisted of a four-day pre-session of cross-cultural training, thirty full-day sessions of lecture and discussion, and a two-day post-session of cross-cultural training. The over-all aim of the Institute was to (1) train a group of library personnel and students in an experimental program relevant to the development of library service to the disadvantaged, (2) evaluate and disseminate the results of that program, and (3) use the program as the basis for planning a specialized minor within the library school curriculum. The experimental training program emphasized participant involvement in program development and evaluation, intensive training experiences in cross-cultural communication, and the presentation of information on a broad range of relevant topics. Some of the unique features of the program were: (1) training sessions conducted by the University's Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research, (2) an introduction to field experience with social agencies and social programs, and (3) the involvement of students and working librarians in a single program emphasizing cooperative group experience and group awareness. (Author/NH)

ED 075059

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NARRATIVE EVALUATION REPORT
ON THE INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING IN LIBRARIANSHIP: The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society: Cross-Cultural Training for Social Action

AT: Graduate School of Library Studies, University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

DATES: August, 1971 to May, 1972

SUBMITTED BY: Joyce H. Haas, Director
Katherine A. Kreamer, Assistant Director

Phone: 808 - 948-7324

Conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Title II-B Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329, as amended.

ED 004 298

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several people who contributed significantly to the Institute are not mentioned in the Narrative Evaluation Report and deserve recognition. Ms. Mary Lee, who conceived the original idea for the Institute, contributed many long hours and many creative ideas to the planning of the program. Dr. Ira Harris, who was Acting Dean of the Graduate School of Library Studies when the Institute was first proposed, not only facilitated the development of the Institute idea but also contributed significantly to the planning and implementation of the program.

Special thanks should also go to the library school office staff -- Ms. Betty Wilson, Ms. Karen Maeda, and Ms. Jan Roberts -- who helped out in many ways over a period of four semesters. In addition, thanks are due to the University's Office of Research Administration, in particular to our Fiscal Officer, Mr. Donald Fujii -- for long-term support, and to Dr. Robert D. Stevens, Dean of the Graduate School of Library Studies.

Last, but by no means least, the Institute could not have been undertaken or completed without the valuable assistance of its part-time student staff: Evaluation Assistants, Mr. Kenneth Wilson and Mr. Marvin Nomi; and Clerical Assistants, Mr. Frank Hoffman, Ms. Amy Lou Kessinger, Ms. Naomi Okumura, and Ms. Karen Yoshimura. Special thanks are also due to Ms. Susan Tamanaha, who helped Ms. Okumura and Ms. Yoshimura in typing this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Summary of the Program	1
	Goals and Objectives	2
	Participants	4
	Course Descriptions	4
	Course Content	5
	Outside Activities	12
	Weekly Schedule	12
	Post-Institute Activities	13
II.	EVALUATION	14
	Evaluation Plan	14
	Participant Evaluation	16
	Outside Evaluation	29
	Staff Self-Evaluation	31
	Six-Month Follow-Up Evaluation	36
III.	CONCLUSIONS	39
	Significant Aspects of the Institute	39
	Implications for Future Institutes or Training Programs	40
	Summary	41

Page

APPENDIX

A. ROSTERS

Roster of Participants A-1

Roster of Staff, Speakers, and Consultants A-6

B. OUTSIDE EVALUATION REPORTS

Professional Library Training Evaluation B-1

Academic Program Evaluation B-3

Cross-Cultural Training Evaluation B-8

C. SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

Methods C-1

Findings C-3

Summary C-13

D. SELECTED EVALUATION DATA

Hawaii Educational Affects Project Survey D-1

Course Expectations and Course Outcomes D-7

Follow-Up Reflections D-9

E. EXHIBITS

Contents E-1

Exhibits E-3

I. INTRODUCTION

Summary of the Program

The Institute involved thirty-one participants (twenty-one working librarians and ten students) in a two-semester program, beginning in August, 1971 and ending in May, 1972. The program consisted of a four-day pre-session of cross-cultural training, thirty full-day sessions of lecture and discussion, and a two-day post-session of cross-cultural training.

The over-all aim of the Institute was to (1) train a group of library personnel and students in an experimental program relevant to the development of library service to the disadvantaged, (2) evaluate and disseminate the results of that program, and (3) use the program as the basis for planning a specialized minor within the library school curriculum. The experimental training program emphasized participant involvement in program development and evaluation, intensive training experiences in cross-cultural communication, and the presentation of information on a broad range of relevant topics by representatives of many disciplines within the university as well as by representatives of social groups and social agencies in the community.

The rationale behind the program was that the problems of providing library service to a society made up of many distinctive groups are problems of inter-group or cross-cultural communication, and that librarians need a greater understanding of themselves and the library in a cultural context as well as a greater understanding of the needs of their communities. Some of the unique features of the program were: (1) training sessions conducted by the University's Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research, utilizing methods developed by the University in training Peace Corps Volunteers, (2) an introduction to field experience with social agencies and social programs, coordinated by the Graduate School of Social Work, and (3) the involvement of students and working librarians (from school, public and college libraries) in a single program emphasizing cooperative group experience and group awareness.

Goals and Objectives

The specific goals and objectives of the Institute were stated as follows:

I. Long-range goals

A. To train a group of library practitioners and students in an experimental, interdisciplinary program in which participants

1. develop an understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings and learn techniques of cross-cultural communication

2. develop knowledge of the many social agencies and social programs within their communities and learn techniques by which librarians may cooperate with other agencies in working for social action

3. set their own goals within this context and help develop a program to meet these goals

B. To evaluate the program and disseminate the results

C. To use the program as the basis for developing a specialized minor within the library school curriculum

II. Program goals

A. (First semester) Developing cultural understanding -- i.e., developing a participant who

1. possesses an awareness and an understanding of himself and others as cultural beings

2. is observant and alert to human behavior as a guide to his own responses and to the responses of others

3. has confidence in himself in his relationships with persons of socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds other than his own

4. has respect for the cultural heritage of his own subgroup in American society and for the heritage of other subgroups within the total American culture

5. sees his activities as a librarian in the context of the development of American libraries and the development of American society

6. can recognize the kind of special knowledge of man and society that he needs in order to serve effectively as a

librarian in a pluralistic society

7. has successfully evaluated himself in terms of cultural understanding, set up goals for himself to achieve in those terms, and evaluated his achievement of those goals.

B. (Second semester) Developing the ability to apply cultural understanding to program development -- i.e., developing a participant who

1. has an awareness of the many social agencies and social programs in Hawaii and on the mainland

2. is aware of ways that libraries may cooperate with other agencies in social action programs

3. has awareness of the problems and conflicts in community planning and library planning

4. has awareness of the political and social forces in the community

5. has confidence and ability to carry out an analysis or study of community needs

6. has the confidence and ability to plan a library program to meet community needs

7. has successfully evaluated his own knowledge concerning the development and planning of social programs, set up goals for himself to achieve in order to increase that knowledge, and evaluated his achievement of those goals.

Participants

The thirty-one Institute participants included twenty-one library practitioners from libraries in rural or urban disadvantaged areas (including one school librarian on sabbatical leave who was also a full-time student in the library school) and ten library school students with an academic background in the social sciences and/or experience or special interest in working with disadvantaged or minority groups.

The library practitioners included six public librarians (branch librarians, bookmobile librarians, and the State Library's Outreach Coordinator), eleven school librarians (from elementary, intermediate, and high schools), and four college librarians (from community colleges, a private urban college, and the University Undergraduate Library). Sixteen of these librarians were from libraries on the island of Oahu. The other five librarians flew in once a week for the Institute from the neighbor islands of Hawaii, Kauai, Lanai and Maui.

The ten students were selected to get as wide a geographical representation as possible. They came from Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Alaska, Hawaii (Oahu), Hawaii (Island of Hawaii), New York, California, and Georgia (via California). Five of the students had had some experience working in a library (four in public libraries, one in a university library).

Ethnic groups represented by the participants included: European American (17), Japanese American (12), Hawaiian (1), and part-Eskimo/Aleut (1). Ages ranged from 21 to 66 with a median of 35. There were two men in the group (one working librarian and one student) and twenty-nine women. Religious affiliations of group members included: Buddhist, Mormon, Protestant, Roman Catholic, and other.

Our intent was to have as heterogeneous group as possible in order to provide the maximum opportunity for cross-cultural experiences within the group itself.

Course Descriptions

The Institute consisted of four three-hour courses, two semesters of LS 693 and two semesters of LS 696. Participants had the option of taking the courses either for credit or not for credit. Twenty-three of the thirty-one participants elected to take the courses for credit.

The official course descriptions for LS 693 and LS 696 follow. The second paragraph of each course description suggests the kinds of term projects which were required in order for participants to obtain graduate credit. Participants, in general, actually completed projects which were more innovative than those outlined in the course descriptions.

1. LS 693: Special Topics in Librarianship: Library Service to the Disadvantaged.

Lectures and discussions on a wide range of topics relevant to the needs of librarians serving disadvantaged or culturally different communities. Relevant information on cultural groups and social forces in the United States, cross-cultural communication, community development and social action programs, social agencies, and community planning, presented by representatives of many disciplines within the university as well as by representatives of social agencies and social groups in the community. Two semesters.

To obtain graduate credit a student must (each semester) either (a) complete a thorough literature search in some problem area relevant to library service to the disadvantaged or culturally different and prepare a review of the literature which could be used as the foundation for some research investigation concerning the problem area, or (b) investigate the availability of library materials for some group or groups of disadvantaged or culturally different users and prepare a thorough bibliography of such materials.

2. LS 696: Field Seminar in Library Service to the Disadvantaged.

Seminar discussions, group learning experiences, and field study relevant to the needs of librarians serving disadvantaged or culturally different communities. Emphasis on cross-cultural communication and development of positive attitudes and confidence concerning interpersonal relations and community planning. Topics and problems presented in LS 693 discussed from the point of view of the library and librarians. Two semesters.

To obtain graduate credit a student must (each semester) complete a special project such as (a) a research investigation of some problem as identified in LS 693, (b) a thorough community study, or (c) the planning of a program of library service for a specific community.

Course Content

Before the Institute began, the directors discussed the content of the four Institute courses, at least briefly, with each participant. To some extent, the course content was fixed -- e.g. speakers from around Hawaii and from the mainland had been invited for specific dates. On the other hand, the content was also somewhat flexible and unfixed in that the participants could introduce new topics or discard old topics as they felt appropriate. This was especially true with LS 696, which was basically a discussion course for which no formal lectures were originally scheduled.

At the beginning of each semester, a proposed course outline was presented to the participants and they worked together with the staff to

develop a program relevant to the needs of every individual.

The following outline is a description of the content of the four Institute courses as it was finally organized by participants and staff together. For each of the 30 all-day sessions there were two themes or questions, one for LS 693 in the morning, the other for LS 696 in the afternoon.

a) First semester

	LS 693	LS 696
9/11/71	1. What is society? What are the ways we may view man in society? How do social institutions operate and how do people view institutions? (Dr. Michael Weinstein, Asst. Prof., Sociology)	The role of the library in human society. Studies of the use and users of libraries. Film: "Library" - San Francisco Public Library.
9/18/71	2. How do people develop attitudes? What is prejudice - a social, cultural or psychological phenomenon? (Dr. Helge Mannson, Assoc. Prof., Psychology)	The personality and image of the librarian. The culture of librarianship. Studies about libraries. Film: "Where is Prejudice?"
9/25/71	3. What are the kinds of group identification that people feel? What are the special needs fulfilled by feelings of ethnic identification (including examples of varying European groups as well as Oriental and other non-European groups)? (Dr. Minako Maykovich, Assoc. Prof., Sociology)	Professionalism: the librarian's identification with the profession.
10/2/71	4. Is the concept of America as a melting pot a valid one? Do we want a totally integrated or a pluralistic society? Can we have both? (Dr. Seymour Lutzky, Prof. & Chairman, American Studies)	The historical role of the library in citizenship education, adult literacy programs, etc. Films: "Step a Little Higher", "A Whole New World".

10/9/71		
5. What has been the evolution of ethnic relations in Hawaii? Is Hawaii now acquiring ethnic problems from the mainland? (Dr. Dennis M. Ogawa, Director, Ethnic Studies)	CCCTR, Dr. James Downs	
10/16/71		
6. What does disadvantaged mean? What is equality of educational opportunity? Can it be legislated? What are some of the important research findings about equality of educational opportunity? (Panel: Dr. James McCutcheon, Assoc. Prof., History and American Studies, Dr. Joseph Hight, Asst. Prof., Economics and Dr. Thomas M.C. Chang, Assoc. Prof., Ed Psych & Director of Hawaii Upward Bound)	Who controls the library and the school? The library in the power structure.	
10/23/71		
7. Is there one American dream for all Americans? (Panel: Jeannine Dunwell, Instructor, School of Nursing; Mark Helbling, Acting Asst. Prof., American Studies and Kenneth Shigekawa, Teacher Asst., Ethnic Studies)	Library myths: the American Library dream.	
10/30/71		
8. What are the forces behind the present unrest in American society? (Dr. Stuart Gerry Brown, Prof. of American Studies)	Role of the library in the current unrest. Is the library a neutral agency or does it take sides? What are the social responsibilities of libraries? Are libraries able to present all sides of every issue? Is there control of the media? Also: Discussion of student projects	
11/6/71		
9. Is there a generation gap? In what way can American youth today be described as a separate culture or a counter culture? (Dr. Richard	Tape: "Political Continuum: George Lincoln Rockwell" Films: "Chicago 1968: Rights in Conflict", "Confrontation in	

Rapson, Director of New College, UH)	Washington: Resurrection City", "Political Protest: The Splinter Group" and "Agnes Varda's Black Panthers; a report".
11/13/71	
10. Is there an American national character? If so, what are the contributions of various groups? If not, what are the separate characters? (Reuel Denney, Prof., American Studies)	CCCTR, William Brenneman and Stuart Kearns
11/20/71	
11. Attend Fall Hawaii Library Association Meeting.	How are attitudes toward "pidgin" in Hawaii related to other American attitudes about speech? What is Hawaiian "pidgin"? What is its social meaning? Is it related to other languages called pidgin? To other dialects in the U.S.? (Michael L. Forman, Asst. Prof., Linguistics and Dr. Elizabeth Carr, Prof. Emeritus, Speech)
11/27/71	
12. Report on the Allerton Institute on Neighborhood Information Centers. (Diana Chang, Head of Social Sciences Reference, Hamilton Library)	The role of the library in preserving and transmitting literary heritage. Do library collections reflect social attitudes? Study of Content Analysis. (Dr. Joyce Haas and Linda Menton) Film: "The Hottest Spot in Town"
12/4/71	
13. Mainland library speaker, Jack Dalton (Director, Library Development Center, Columbia University) to discuss the relevance of current social science research to contemporary library problems.	Morning session continued with opportunity for discussion and specific problems of participants.
12/11/71	
14. What are the techniques that sociologists, anthropologists and social workers use in analyzing a community and why? (Panel: Dr.	Discussion of second semester social work project. (Dr. Mildred Sikkema, Prof. and Miss Marjorie Morris, Asst. Prof., School of Social Work)

Robert Harrison, Research Associate,
tion Institute, Dr. Michael
ein, Asst. Prof., Sociology,
dred Sikkema, Prof., School
Social Work)

12/13/71

15. Library surveys: How are they done? (with pertinent examples) Mainland library speaker: Dr. Thomas Shaughnessy, Director, Dana Library and Assoc. Prof. of Library Service, Rutgers University.

Morning session continued with opportunity for discussion of specific problems of participants.

b) Second semester

LS 693	LS 696
1/22/72	
1. Group session with CCCTR - Goals for second semester, etc.	Introduction to field work and general orientation to social work - with Dr. Sikkema and Miss Morris of the School of Social Work.
1/29/72	
2. What is community planning? What is library planning? How can you involve the community in planning? What are the effects of planning on individuals, groups, and society? (Panel: Donna Garcia, Director, State Library Services, Dr. Daniel Sanders, Assoc. Prof., School of Social Work, Dr. Elizabeth Wittermans, Assoc. Prof., Human Development)	Study of Booz Allen Hamilton report on planning for libraries in Hawaii. Tape of radio broadcast by Rev. Msgr. Charles A. Kekumano, for Hawaiian Civic Clubs--on planning in Honolulu.
2/5/72	
3. An over-view of agencies, programs, etc. related to the "War on Poverty." (Panel: Katherine Kreamer, GSLS; Winifred Ishimoto, Asst. Prof., Graduate School of Social Work)	Special mainland library speaker: Miss Jewel Walton, Research and Development Librarian, Woodbridge Public Library, N.J.
2/12/72	
4. What is meaningful grass-	Do libraries need community

roots involvement in social action programs? (Panel: Nina Collins, Welfare Recipients Advisory Council; Jane Giddings, Hawaii Council for Housing Action, Mildred Johansen, Human Services Worker, Edward Wake, Health & Community Service Council)	involvement in book selection, program planning, etc.? How should community involvement be accomplished? Film: "Aala."
2/19/72	
5. Mainland Library Speaker to discuss program planning: Miss Genevieve Casey, Assoc. Professor, Dept. of Lib. Sci., Wayne State University, to discuss the implementation of library service programs.	Morning session continued with opportunity for discussion of specific problems of participants.
2/26/72	
6. What are some specific problems that social action programs in Hawaii are aimed at? (Miss Marjorie Morris, Asst. Prof., School of Social Work)	How active a role does the library play in solving community problems? Can the librarian do socially relevant work without becoming a social worker?
3/4/72	
7. Are there identifiable over-all long range goals to present social programs? To what extent are programs developed in response to specific crises? What roles do pressure groups play in the development of programs? (Dr. Mildred Sikkema, Prof., School of Social Work)	Same questions as they apply to libraries. Films: Children and drugs in Hawaii-"Why must the flowers die?" and "I Quit." Community action-"Man of Action" and "Saul Alinsky Went to War."
3/11/72	
8. Mainland Library Speaker to discuss specific programs: Dr. Hardy Franklin, Asst. Professor, Dept. of Lib. Sci., Queens College, to speak on public library programs in relation to the needs of black inner-city communities.	Morning session continued with opportunity for discussion of specific problems of participants.
3/18/72	
9. Group session with CCCTR.	Field work discussion and feedback

	with Dr. Sikkema and Miss Morris, School of Social Work.
3/25/72	
10. What are the special needs of isolated people (the aged, blind, people in institutions)? What is the role of the library in the rehabilitation of institutionalized and handicapped people? (Panel: Camille Almy, Program Specialist, Teacher Assist Center, Dr. Cecil Dotts, Community Service Volunteer, Nancy Kickertz, Graduate Student, School of Social Work and Lydia Ranger, Librarian, State Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped)	Student-directed outreach program for faculty and students of GSLS.
4/15/72	
11. Attend HLA and HASL Spring meetings.	Mainland Library Speaker to discuss specific programs: Mr. John F. Anderson, Director, San Francisco Public Library, to discuss new directions in service to the disadvantaged.
4/22/72	
12. What have been the approaches of various War on Poverty programs? How have they differed? (Panel: Royce Higa, Exec. Dir., Honolulu Community Action Program; George Lee, State Liaison to Model Cities; Louis Stibbard, Education Officer, Hawaii Job Corps and Charles Wothke, Director, Human Services Center)	What has been the experience of the library with War on Poverty programs? Should the library be a part of a "model City"? Films: "We are Hawaii" (Model Cities) and "The Right to Read" (HEW)
4/29/72	
13. How can social action programs be evaluated in terms of meeting community needs? How can evaluation lead to program modification? (Dr. Edith Doi, U.H. Community Colleges)	How can libraries evaluate programs in terms of the actual meeting of community needs? How can evaluation lead to program modification?

5/6/72	
14. Field work discussion and feedback with Dr. Sikkema and Miss Morris, School of Social Work.	Discussion of the place of the library in cooperation with other social agencies. What are the information needs of various agencies? How could the library help meet them?
5/13/72	
CCCTR Training Experience	CCCTR Training Experience
5/14/72	
	CCCTR Training Experience (12:00-5:00)
5/15/72	
15. Summary Evaluation Session	Summary Evaluation Session

Outside Activites

Experiences outside the classroom included:

1. Cross-cultural communication exercises
2. Field experience (second semester) in cooperation with the Graduate School of Social Work, including
   a. Observation of (and/or participation in) the activities of a social agency or social program
   b. Discussion and consultation with Social Work faculty in evaluating the field experience
3. Independent field experience in a library or library related activity
4. Visits by participants to the libraries of fellow participants

Weekly Schedule

1. First semester
   a. August 23-27: Institute Registration
   b. August 27, 28, 30, 31: Cross-Cultural Training Experiences (CCCTR)

c. September 11-December 18: Class sessions each Saturday

2. Second semester

a. January 22-March 25: Class sessions each Saturday

b. April 1-8: Spring vacation

c. April 15-May 6: Class sessions each Saturday

d. May 13-14: 2-day Post-Session Training Experiences (CCCTR)

e. May 15: Summary Evaluation Session

Post-Institute Activities

After the conclusion of the Institute, the Directors and three Institute participants (selected by lots from the twenty-one federally supported participants) attended the Annual Conference of the American Library Association in Chicago.

This group attended the many meetings dealing with library service to minorities and the disadvantaged. Each of the three participants wrote a report of the experience.

Six months after the Institute, one of the participants compiled and edited a newsletter which -- along with the three ALA Conference Reports -- was distributed to all participants. (See Appendix E for Newsletter and ALA Reports.)

II. EVALUATION

Evaluation Plan

The following outline describes the program of self-evaluation and outside evaluation undertaken during and after the Institute.

I. Self-Evaluation

A. Pre-Testing (at beginning of program)

1. Participants are given

a. an attitude survey

b. a questionnaire concerning their expectations of the program

c. a questionnaire concerning personal characteristics (age, sex, ethnic group, etc.)

2. Supervisors of practitioner participants are given a questionnaire concerning their expectations of the program

B. Process: Participants

1. Keep a journal of personal progress throughout the Institute

2. Participate in three evaluation sessions each semester

a. conducted by the staff of the CCCTR

b. concerned with reviewing and revising personal and program goals and determining future action

3. Submit (on an anonymous and voluntary basis) weekly feedback slips detailing what they liked and/or disliked about each session and any suggestions for future sessions

4. Are given a feedback survey covering their reactions to each individual session and speaker

a. at the end of the first semester

b. at the end of the second semester

C. Post-Testing (at end of program)

1. Participants are given

a. an attitude survey

b. a questionnaire concerning their view of the outcomes of the pro

c. a narrative evaluation questionnaire covering

(1) an overall view of the Institute

(2) the role of the CCCTR

(3) the role of the Graduate School of Social Work

d. a faculty evaluation questionnaire for evaluating

(1) the Institute Director

(2) the Institute Assistant Director

2. Supervisors of practitioner participants are given a questionnaire concerning their view of the outcomes of the program

D. Follow-Up (six months after conclusion of Institute)

1. Participants are given a questionnaire and are interviewed concerning the value of the program to

a. themselves

b. their job situation, in terms of

(1) understanding of the community and the library's role in the community

(2) planning of programs to meet community needs

2. Supervisors of practitioner participants are given a questionnaire and are interviewed concerning

a. whether the program seemed to meet their expectations

b. the apparent value of the program to the participant's job performance

II. Outside Evaluation

A. Evaluators:

1. a representative of the Hawaii State Library System

2. a representative of the University academic staff

3. an evaluator of cross-cultural training programs

B. Procedure

1. visits by each evaluator (first semester and second semester) to

   a. observe the program in action

   b. examine the self-evaluation data collected by the Institute

2. preparation and submission of written reports concerning observed achievement of Institute and participant goals

Participant Evaluation[1]

I. The Attitude Survey

Since so many of the Institute's goals were concerned with cultural or ethnic attitudes, we administered an attitude survey to the participants at the beginning of the year and again at the end of the year. The survey we used was a questionnaire developed by the Hawaii Educational Affects Project (HEAP) for use with University of Hawaii undergraduates in 1970.[2] (See Appendix E - Exhibits.)

There were some problems with the questionnaire because it was intended for undergraduates and our group was considerably older and more experienced than the typical undergrad. Nevertheless, the HEAP questionnaire was the best instrument we could find for assessing attitudes toward the many ethnic and cultural groups represented in Hawaii.

Although the relative sophistication of the Institute group prompted a certain amount of resistance to the questionnaire and quite a few skeptical comments on attitude surveys in general, the data collected

---

[1]Assistance in computer tabulation and analysis of evaluation data was provided by Kenneth W. Wilson, candidate for the Ph.D. in Social Psychology, University of Hawaii.

[2]Hawai'i Educational Affects Project; Earl R. Babbie, Director. Honolulu, University of Hawaii, Survey Research Office, 1970.

from the two surveys does not appear to indicate that participants were answering carelessly or dishonestly.

Whether or not the data collected from the HEAP questionnaire says anything about the real attitudes of the thirty-one Institute participants is a moot point which could be debated for as long as one wanted to debate the efficacy of attitude surveys. However, the before-after survey did show that -- in several categories of questions -- participants expressed one attitude in August, 1971 and expressed another attitude in May, 1972.

The changes that were observed between before scores and after scores were tested for statistical significance using the McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes, the Binomial Test, and the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test. Significant changes (at the .05 level) were found in questions expressing political orientations, social orientations, educational orientations, and personal (self) orientations. (See Appendix D for selected questions and data.)

In several questions, participants expressed increased acceptance of black Americans. They also expressed increased tolerance of politcal extremists -- both on the left and on the right. They expressed changed views on campus unrest and drugs as well as on traditional roles for men and women.

One of the more significant changes, in terms of the over-all goals of the Institute, was the difference expressed in the participants' view of poverty. Participants were asked to decide who is "to blame" for poverty, the individual or society, and to express this "blame" on a 6-point scale thus:

Individual					Society
1	2	3	4	5	6

The mean ranking for the before test was 3.9. In the after test, participants expressed a greater conviction that society is "to blame" with a mean ranking of 4.5.

In general, the changed expressions of attitude represented more open and accepting views in the after test. There was some tendency away from dogmatically positive or negative answers toward more neutral or questioning views. Many additional changes (significant at .06 to .10) reflected further tendencies comparable to the above.

II. Course Expectations and Course Outcomes

At the beginning of the Institute all of the participants, as well as the supervisors of the working participants, were given a standard Course Expectations Survey developed by Dr. Gerald Meredith, the University of Hawaii's Evaluation Officer. Participants and supervisors were asked to indicate the importance they attached to various possible

affective and cognitive outcomes of the course. At the end of the Institute, participants and supervisors were asked to indicate to what degree the various outcomes were achieved on a follow-up survey form also developed by Dr. Meredith. (For Expectations and Outcomes Questionnaires, see Appendix E. For data, see Appendix D.)

Analysis of these questionnaires revealed that supervisors and working participants viewed the Institute rather differently at the outset but not so differently at the end. More significantly, the various kinds of participants (students, public librarians, school librarians, and college librarians) had quite different expectations and quite different feelings of accomplishment at the end.

In the end, the college librarians and the students felt that their greatest gains were in "my understanding of other people." The public librarians and the school librarians felt their greatest gains were in being "stimulated to strive for excellence in my own communication." Only the school librarians felt that they had really gained much "practical 'know-how' for a job."

It is interesting to note in relation to these findings that the college librarians and students included many recent arrivals to Hawaii from the mainland and the public and school librarians were for the most part long-time residents of Hawaii. For some mainland students, the Institute provided the first social contact of a lifetime with individuals of ethnic groups other than their own. For most, it provided the first extensive contact with Asian Americans.

The fact that two of the school librarians were beginning their very first year as librarians (after having worked for some years as teachers) may have accounted for that group's scoring higher than others on gaining "practical know-how."

The Outcomes Questionnaire was administered a second time to participants and supervisors as a part of the Six-Month Follow-Up Study. Further comment on the questionnaire appears in the report of that study.

III. Participant Feedback Surveys

Two formal channels were set up to supplement the informal means available to participants for expressing their feelings about individual Institute sessions. First, Feedback Forms - inviting participants to "indicate your positive and/or negative feelings about [each session] and any suggestions you may have about future [sessions]" - were made available for students to fill in (anonymously) at every session. Second, a summary questionnaire, soliciting feedback on each individual session, was administered at the end of the first semester and again at the end of the second semester.

The weekly feedback slips were extremely useful to the Director and Assistant Director in planning and/or modifying subsequent sessions. A

number of changes were made in scheduled sessions as a result of participant suggestions or comments on feedback slips. Although most of the comments were favorable, participants did use the slips to express their unfavorable feelings often enough that the feedback form seemed to be providing a valuable communication channel.

The end-of-semester feedback surveys revealed that the various kinds of participants had varying reactions to individual sessions. In general, these reactions reflected the varying needs of the different groups. Public librarians, for example, responded most favorably to a session discussing neighborhood information centers. School librarians, on the other hand, were most impressed by a panel discussion on the meaning of "disadvantaged" and "equality of educational opportunity."

At the end of the second semester, participants expressed generally more positive reactions to the sessions than they had at the end of the first semester. An exception to this was the negative reaction expressed to the two sessions in which the coordinators from the School of Social Work had discussed the participants' field work experience.

IV. Narrative Evaluation and Participant Journals

Among all of the structured forms and surveys, there was a need for some less rigid way for participants to evaluate their progress in the Institute. Some participants kept journals and reported that reading the entries over at the end helped them see more clearly the changes they had gone through. A few participants shared their journals with the Director and Assistant Director. Those journals revealed that their authors were thoughtful and perceptive and not at all afraid of examining their own attitudes quite closely. The developing self-awareness expressed in those journals gave the directors a greater feeling of closeness with the participants and provided a most important kind of feedback on how participants were internalizing what was happening in the Institute.

At the summary evaluation session, on the last day of the second semester, participants were given the chance to express their over-all feelings in a three-part Narrative Evaluation Survey. (See Appendix E for survey form.) The first part of the survey concerned participant feelings about the Institute as a whole. Part II was concerned with participant feelings about the contribution of the trainers from the Center for Cross Cultural Training and Research (CCCTR). Part III asked for participant feelings about the contribution of the School of Social Work.

Part I of the survey gave participants the choice of answering one out of five questions. The resulting answers were thoughtful essays in which participants expressed a wide variety of reactions to the Institute -- from the extremely positive to one extremely negative. The following excerpts from some of those essays give a better picture than any other evaluation data of the way participants felt about the Institute at its conclusion.

1. How do you feel you will use what you have gotten from the Institute?

Four participants chose to answer this question. Two working librarians commented:

"From the Institute I have derived ideas for programs and services, techniques for evaluation of existing services, a more positive feeling about the role a library can play in the community, some perceptions for increasing communication with residents in the neighborhood served by the library...

"I come away from the Institute with more confidence to go into the community, although I know communication with residents with differing attitudes and values is very difficult."

"Prior to the Institute I would have rated my library service fairly high and my understanding of the people I serve as very high, but the Institute has broadened my base for the evaluation of library services. As a result, the same services and the same degree of understanding would receive a much lower rating. At the same time, my confidence, after reaching an all-time low, has increased and I feel that I can reach out to those who have not been served and to those people and agencies who can help."

2. "The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society: Cross-Cultural Training for Social Action." What does the title of the Institute really mean?

Two participants selected this question.

"Indeed, we are living in a pluralistic society where many, many people are not really being helped or given needed assistance because they are not understood. Because the pace of life is so fast, many people don't take the time to really get to know one another -- such as neighbors, co-workers, people we see every day but really don't know...

"At the beginning of the course I may have made rash statements such as 'Samoans are lazy and you can't reason with them' or 'Filipinos are so clannish and don't want to really learn our way of life.' But this is no longer true. Now I tend to take each individual as he is, and I have tried not to pigeon-hole them in any type of role or mold (stereotype roles). I am more open about cultural differences."

"I never really took the Institute's formal title seriously, to begin with... After having been through the Institute and participated in the tremendous wealth and variety of experiences it has offered, I feel the Institute title has a new meaning...

"We see our job not as it has been regarded in the past as a preserver of information and knowledge about institutions of the past, but as a participant in a cultural process that leads on to a more promising future."

3. Describe what the Institute has meant to you.

Most of the participants (18) chose to answer this personal and very open-ended question. Some answered in terms of their jobs, some in terms of the Institute as an educational experience, and some commented on the

personal experience which the Institute had been for them.

Job-related comments:

"I think I have reached a point of 'no-return' -- I've had feelings of despair before -- of not being able to really understand our students of varied backgrounds who cannot function well in our schools. I don't know all of the answers -- who really does in this ever-changing society? However, this Institute has brought so many changes in my thinking and action. I think that I will be able to confront the issues and do a better job in working with our students and teachers. I am not the same person I was last August as far as my relationship with people is concerned -- I can look at things in a different way -- I hope that others will see changes in me and accept my sincere efforts to reach people."

"It has helped me see our library patrons in a more understanding light and given me the added incentive to really be more helpful. I also see co-worker relationships in a deeper way. I understand the problems better now, but am just beginning to attempt some improvements."

"I have become more aware of the needs of my own community and become actively involved rather than taking a passive interest... However, I haven't come to a conclusion as to how I can serve the poverty level 'patron' more effectively in my community."

Several students commented on the format and educational philosophy of the Institute:

"I'm glad it was a year long because it takes me quite a while to get to know people or feel comfortable among them and I think we needed a year to develop the trust, cooperation, and friendliness of the whole group."

"I feel the opportunity to mingle with, discuss and socially interact with the professional librarians was very significant. It has provided an insight into some of the real, day-to-day problems encountered by librarians in the field. I feel they have benefited as well, in that new ideas and changes or solutions to some of their problems were proposed...

"I also feel that the way in which the Institute was set up, with 31 participants meeting every week for 8 hours, 2 semesters, helped me in my learning process. It gave a sense of security and warmth to the education process which is lacking in other classes where students meet for an hour a week, then may not see each other again."

"I feel the Institute has strengthened my conviction of competing with myself rather than with others. Learning is a self-fulfilling process. It is not to do better than anyone else but to do better than what you were before."

Comments on the Institute as a personal experience:

"The Institute was a starting point for me. The speakers and discussions touched on many things that I hadn't been aware of. My life had been fairly simple. I had never gone out of my way to look at the problems, or even the characteristics of society. My life had touched on some of these problems, but I didn't have enough background or foresight to feel that I could do anything about them.

"The first semester of the Institute was eye-opening. I learned. Mostly what I learned about was other people. But in that process, I had to compare with myself. I've become unsettled and I don't know when or how my thoughts will fall into a pattern...

"There are still many questions that I have to answer for myself. Like: What efforts will I make to get to know people who are culturally different? Can I have them for friends even if I don't agree with them? How do I work with them in the best possible way? Do I have the strength to get involved? How activist can I be as a librarian?"

"I find that my prejudices toward some persons of some races has surfaced and that is a comfort rather than an embarrassment, because I can now work more intellectually with something I know about."

"I feel more confident in my relationships with people of other cultures and races, whether disadvantaged or not. I'm not saying that this confidence makes me absolutely sure that I will always be accepted by anyone else and no more problems -- All I mean is that I now have the courage to make the contact."

"Whatever success I feel about being a good librarian today I owe in large part to this Institute ... I can say now I love being a librarian and I wonder why I didn't become one sooner."

"I am twice as alive today as I was in August of 1971."

4. What do you think about the question that Institutes such as this one might not benefit the poor but might simply benefit the Institute participants?

This question, a paraphrase of one asked by an Institute participant during a group discussion near the end of the second semester, was included in the final evaluation survey to encourage the expression of negative feelings. When the question had been asked in group discussion, the group had avoided it completely. In the evaluation survey, the question elicited an extremely negative diatribe against the Institute as well as some rather heated defenses of it. Some of the comments were:

"It is possible that the seeds of destruction were extant in the Institute from its inception ... we are all middle class and fairly prosperous. Here we've spent 9 months blabbing about the poor, poverty, slums, ghettos et al. and the Institute made no real effort to move our experiences from textbooks to real life. It's absurd the more I think of it."

"I hope that the question posed is not one said for real except perhaps accusingly or jealously by someone not in the Institute ... Mostly what I think about the Institute benefiting only its participants and not the poor is that it is absurd."

"Granted the Institute participants might initially seem to have benefited most ... But I believe that all participants are bound 'to make some waves' -- not a tidal wave, which is abrupt and short in duration, but more like ripples and gentle surf which are constantly and continually washing ashore ... This Institute has made it possible for me to believe again that there are people who care about others who are less fortunate, and more optimistic that social change can be made."

5. Evaluate the Institute by your own criteria.

This question also elicited negative as well as positive responses. On the positive side:

"Being a part of a supportive group has meant a great deal to me ... The second semester was very satisfying as it came closer to my expectations of getting to the 'meat' of the Institute. I do, however, feel that the first semester laid a good groundwork of information which we were able to utilize in the second semester."

On the negative side:

"I feel ... that we took too much time to get where we are today. There was too much 'loose' talking, too many long breaks, too many late starts and delayed endings. I think future Institutes should be careful about this -- We all know the stereotype of 'hen parties' ...

"I also feel that the set of courses could be trimmed to 2 instead of 4, by streamlining the sessions, with a tighter control on the discussions. A lot of the material conveyed to us in the second semester could have been obtained in written form. Much of it was irrelevant anyway to library service."

"Generally I found the morning sessions more meaningful and worthwhile. Some of the afternoons seemed to drag on and discussions were repetitious and unnecessary ... I am not sure whether I would ever commit myself to participate in an Institute again that lasts for an entire year and that meets all day Saturday, as worthwhile as this experience usually was... It seemed at times that I did not apply as much of what I was learning to the [work] situation, because I physically did not have the energy or stamina."

All of the questions were, of course, simply variations on "What do you think of the Institute now that it's over?" The variety of responses reflected the variety of participants (who had been selected initially to make as heterogeneous group as possible). Some people liked the first semester, some the second. Some felt the lecturers were the most important thing, some preferred the discussions. Requests for a less time-consuming

program came from the working librarians, who had taken on a sixth work day with the Institute. Students, on the other hand, were most emphatic about the value of a two-semester, 12-credit program -- a program which made up one-third of their library school studies.

It was clear from the responses that the experience had been, for the most part, quite different for students and for working librarians. Perhaps most significantly, the one extremely negative response pointed out the fact that while the working librarians could relate what went on in the Institute to the "disadvantaged" communities in which they worked, the students -- if they did not choose to do a field work project in a poverty community, were not forced into contact with poor people. Some students did choose field work projects which brought them into contact with the poor. The student who complained of "9 months blabbing about the poor" did not -- and was, justifiably, angry at the Institute for not making it easier to do so.

In spite of the special problems that students had, one student wrote such a thoughtful and self-possessed reaction that it is reproduced in its entirety below -- not as an example of anything that the Institute accomplished but as an example of what one student, who came to the Institute already well advanced in terms of the program's goals, was able to do with the experience.

> "I guess in generalized terms, the over-all guiding theme is 'positivism'. I've reinforced my feelings about being positive, and I've seen more than ever the role it plays in being an effective person and an effective worker. I can't say that I've learned that x-y-z will work in a given situation, but I think what I have learned, and what's probably really important, is that a particular frame of mind, awareness and responsiveness, is what's important. (Be 'open-minded not empty-headed,' as Genevieve Casey said.) Take an open, receptive person and put him or her in most any situation and he'll probably be effective. Be always open, creative, and evaluate where you are and where you want to go. Never be self-satisfied, always question and respond and leave yourself open to receive questions and responses. Not particularly 'librarian' lessons, but perhaps what makes a good librarian, after all, is someone who's not locked-into the institution and tradition of the position."

Students like that make teachers feel very humble.

The second and third parts of the Narrative Evaluation Survey -- concerning participant feelings about the CCCTR trainers and the School of Social Work -- displayed, again, considerable difference of opinion.

What part did the CCCTR play in the Institute as far as you were concerned?

In general, feelings about the CCCTR were favorable. Most participants felt the trainers had helped the group get acquainted and helped individuals get to know themselves, though one participant found their

techniques "geared to adolescents" and another thought "everything ... was pretty mild." The activity which most participants found useful was role-playing. The other activity most commented on was video-taping, which troubled almost as many people as it pleased.

A more complete analysis of participant reactions to the CCCTR is contained in the initial outside evaluation report prepared by Dr. Walter Jaeckle, the Training Evaluator. (See Section on Outside Evaluation below and Appendix B.)

What part did the School of Social Work play in the Institute as far as you were concerned?

Reactions to the School of Social Work, though in some cases extremely critical, were for the most part politely favorable. Nearly everyone commented in some way that it was a good idea to have the two schools - The Graduate School of Social Work and the Graduate School of Library Studies involved in a joint program. Participants saw this as a kind of breakthrough which added a new dimension to their thinking about library service.

Many participants commented on the contrasting teaching styles of the two Social Work professors. One of the two was perceived as warm and concerned about participant goals, the other was perceived as contributing intellectually but perhaps a bit too aloof. A number of participants found this professor's intellectual contributions valuable. One participant commented that the professor "gave much in content and food for thought." However, other participants were apparently "turned off" by the professor's teaching style. As one participant put it, this professor ...

> "said one thing and did another. She said she wanted us to talk, but she monopolized the floor. She did provide valuable insights but she could have interjected them as the conversation went that way. I found her methods deadening."

Perhaps the most serious criticisms of the Social Work component of the Institute were those concerned - in one way or another - with apparent lack of planning. A number of participants commented that the field work feedback sessions conducted by the Social Work professors were repetitive. Others commented that the professors had not helped them enough in setting up field work experiences. Several people commented that perhaps the field work might have been more successfully carried out without the aid of the Social Work professors. As one participant observed about the field experiences:

> "The most successful ones seem to have forged ahead and worked on their own, or (in time-honored island tradition) worked with personal friends who had an 'in'."

In general, those participants who did become involved in a field work experience, were very positive about the experience and felt they had learned a lot. However, a number of participants commented on a certain fogginess about over-all goals -- expressed as "some confusion

or lack of understanding" or "very little guidelines." One participant summed it up as follows:

> "What part did the School of Social Work play in the Institute? I was never clear as to what exactly their part was. I supposed that the second semester of the Institute was to be pretty much in their care and that they would bear a heavy share in the success or failure of the service part of the Institute. The impression faded somewhat as the Institute progressed. It seemed to become evident that [they] already had too much work to do in their own department to give us more than the Saturday meetings they gave. And these turned out to be warmed over lectures to their social work students. I appreciated the new viewpoints they brought and I learned to make closer distinctions of ideas in the field of social work, but the relevance to librarianship was always marginal, it seemed to me. I don't know if they themselves quite knew why they were meeting with us. We must have looked to them like a bungling bunch of amateur social workers 'slumming' it."

A number of other participants also commented on the Social Work professors' apparent lack of time. Several participants commented that they felt they were "imposing" on the professors' time.

Although these criticisms seem to be directed only at the professors from the School of Social Work, the Institute staff obviously shared in the responsibility for what was apparently a lack of communication and a lack of adequate planning. Whatever the reasons, Institute participants did express some degree of disappointment with the Social work component of the program. One participant, evaluating the "weight" of each component of the Institute, estimated the portion coordinated by the two directors in the library school as one-half, the portion contributed by the CCCTR as three-eighths, and the portion contributed by the School of Social Work as one-eighth.

V. Participant Evaluation of Institute Staff

At the end of the second semester, participants were asked to evaluate the two Institute directors by filling out a survey developed by Dr. Gerald Meredith to measure the "Impact of Instructor on The Student and The Course." Due to an unfortunate oversight, the survey forms were duplicated with only a four-point scale to measure the instructors' impact in various areas (e.g. preparation and organization, speech and enunciation, adequate knowledge of the subject, etc.). (See Appendix for survey form.) The use of a four-point scale doubtless did not allow participants to express enough variety of opinion, and there was not much variation in the almost entirely positive ratings.

However, the comments at the bottom of the survey form did offer some insights into the reactions of individual participants to each of the two Institute directors. In general, participants found both staff members supportive and encouraging. The director was criticized by several participants for not being a very dynamic speaker, and both the

director and the assistant director were taken to task for being too neutral and not expressing their own ideas often enough (although participants admitted they knew that this was a technique to encourage them to develop their own ideas). A number of participants commented favorably on the team-work displayed by the two directors.

Although it was doubtless pleasant for the participants to be able to express so many positive feelings as well as for the instructors to get such positive feedback, probably a more appropriate survey form could have been developed to measure variations in participant feelings about the staff.

As it was, the instructor evaluation served as a sort of positive reinforcement for a general feeling of camaraderie and good fellowship at the end of the Institute. Possibly that was as important a service as a more accurate measurement of variation in impact might have been.

VI. Participant Academic Evaluation and Grades

In August, at the beginning of the Institute program, participants were given a suggested outline for a system of "public" and "private" evaluation. (See Appendix E for outline.) All participants, whether they took the Institute courses for credit or not, were to participate in the "private" evaluation process - which combined self-evaluation with two scheduled conferences with the instructors each semester, one no later than the fifth week, the second at the end of the semester.

Only those participants taking the Institute courses for credit participated in the system of "public" evaluation. In that system, the participants graded themselves according to their own criteria for self-evaluation and the instructors graded the participants' term projects (in joint conference with the participants) according to the criteria of relevance, discovery of new (to the participant) ideas or information, and the extent of communication to others. The final grade was negotiated by the participant and the instructors in conference, based upon the self-grade and project grade combined.

At the end of the Institute, a narrative evaluation report on each participant taking the courses for credit was filed with the Graduate School of Library Studies. These reports, written by the two directors jointly, were shown to each of these participants on the last day of the Institute -- before being entered into the files. (A letter of commendation was sent to the supervisors of each of the participants who did not take the courses for credit.)

The process of self-evaluation was extremely difficult for most participants, but this process -- plus the periodic conferences with the directors -- seemed to contribute to participant self-awareness in a very useful way. For the most part, the conferences served as positive reinforcement for the participants. They also helped to identify problems which otherwise might have gone unnoticed.

At the end of the first semester, all but two credit participants

received a grade of A. The two who did not, both full-time students, received grades of Incomplete. They later made up their incomplete work during the Interim Session and the second semester and received final grades of A. At the end of the second semester, all credit participants received A's.

The projects that participants undertook varied considerably -- depending upon the participant's experience and interests. (See Appendix E for a complete list.) One participant conducted a user study of her branch library first semester, and second semester designed and implemented a State-wide, machine-tabulated study of public library users. Another participant developed a slide-tape orientation program for her school library. One of the students spent both semesters investigating adult basic education and produced an annotated bibliography at the end of the second semester which was subsequently reproduced and distributed throughout the State.

Some students had difficulty selecting a term project during the first semester. It was easier for the working librarians to judge what was relevant to their needs. Some of the students completely new to librarianship needed most of the first semester for orientation.

VII. Field Work Evaluation

During the second semester, most participants undertook field work projects either in addition to or in combination with their academic term projects. (See Appendix E for a list of the projects.) One student did volunteer work at a drug-abuse clinic; another worked with two social work students to develop a program for children in a low-income housing project. One school librarian became her school's representative on the school-community Parents Advisory Council. Another school librarian established a liaison with the Headstart program in her neighborhood. A student, working together with the State Library's Consultant for Institutional Library Service, developed and implemented a survey of the inmates of the State Prison, and - based on the survey - developed and implemented a book selection program for the prison library.

At the end of the second semester, a questionnaire was sent to the various agencies at which participants had done field work projects in order to evaluate the experiences from the agencies' point-of-view. (See Appendix for questionnaire form.) As has been noted above, the School of Social Work did not play as large a part in the coordination of field work as had been anticipated. It had originally been hoped that the Social Work professors would solicit feedback from the agencies and share it with the participants. They did not, however, and the questionnaire form was developed by the Institute's Assistant Director - with the assistance of the junior Social Work professor - somewhat at the last minute. As a result, it was not - unfortunately - possible to share the feedback with participants.

Nevertheless, the questionnaires did provide some valuable feedback for the library school -- and, as it was shared with Ms. Itamura

of the State Library and with Ms. Nakamura, the State Library's Outreach Coordinator, feedback for the State Library as well. Comments on participants themselves were for the most part quite positive. All but one agency answered that they would like to have a library school student visit or participate in their program again the next year. (The one answered "don't know".) Of particular interest to both the library school and the State Library were the comments that agency personnel made in answer to the question: "What special services do you think a library might provide for your clients and/or staff?"

Two facilities requested to be put on the Bookmobile route. (Service has since been instituted.) Other requests were for story-telling service, professional reference collections for agency workers, loan of paperback books, help in cataloging professional materials already in the agencies, provision of specific ethnic materials, provision of materials for discussion groups -- and many requests for "outreach" -- for bringing the library to low-income neighborhoods where residents find it difficult to get to the nearest branch library.

Perhaps the most important results of the field work experiences -- in addition to the positive feelings that participants themselves expressed about gaining actual experience in the community -- were the establishment of contacts between libraries and community agencies and organizations, and the introduction of librarians to community workers.

Outside Evaluation

Three outside evaluators were hired to observe the program in action during both semesters and to prepare reports at the end of the second semester. Each of the three evaluators was to consider a separate aspect of the Institute program. Ms. Ruth Itamura, Acting Director, Public Libraries Branch, Hawaii State Library, evaluated the professional library in-service training aspects of the program. Dr. Robert Kamins, Professor of Economics (formerly Dean for Academic Development), University of Hawaii, evaluated the academic aspects of the program. Dr. Walter Jaeckle, Consulting Psychologist, evaluated the cross-cultural training aspects of the program. (During the first semester, the cross-cultural training evaluation was carried out by Dr. Jaeckle's colleague, Dr. Kenneth David.)

The complete texts of the reports by Ms. Itamura, Dr. Kamins, and Dr. Jaeckle appear in Appendix B. Brief summaries and discussions of the findings of each evaluator appear below.

I. Professional Library Training Evaluation

As an administrator in the State Library System, Ms. Itamura was, of course, known to many of the participants and had more than an academic interest in the program of the Institute. For these reasons, she acted as a participant-observer at a number of sessions and did not attempt to remain entirely in the background as did the other two evaluators. Because we did not want anyone to feel that she might be judging

individual participants in any way (which she was not), we did not introduce her to the group as an evaluator. In fact, none of the evaluators was presented as such. They were all simply introduced as guests.

At any rate, Ms. Itamura really served a dual function during the Institute. She not only evaluated and observed the program, she also served as a valuable liaison with the State Library System.

In general, Ms. Itamura's evaluation of the program was positive. She seemed to feel that it was a good beginning for the librarians involved. She cited the contacts established with community representatives and the planning, surveying, and evaluation skills developed in the Institute as particularly valuable to public librarians.

II. Academic Program Evaluation

Not only in his final report but also in several discussions with the director throughout the year, Dr. Kamins provided a most useful evaluative perspective. He was, perhaps, the most "outside" of the three outside evaluators - having no real connection with libraries or with any segment of the Institute structure - and he thus contributed objective insights to the staff's thinking about the Institute.

Dr. Kamin's report cited some weakness in the area of the field work experience and the Social Work component of the Institute, but generally described the Institute as a successful academic program. His report concluded with the following summary:

> "1. The 1971-72 Institute of the University of Hawaii, 'The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society,' seems to have been quite successful, not only in retaining all 31 participants over the full academic year, but in achieving its major goals.
>
> "2. Much of its strength lies in its ability to use a block of the participants' time -- most of the time between breakfast and dinner over nine months of Saturdays -- in a multi-disciplinary examination of the subject.
>
> "3. The integration in the curriculum of people and techniques from a broad range of academic and professional acitivities was found to be stimulating by most participants.
>
> "4. While the selection of lecturers, discussion leaders, etc. was generally quite good, with the experience of 1971-72 improvements can be made.
>
> "5. The format and approach of the Institute can contribute a useful alternative (minor) within the curriculum of the School of Library Studies."

Dr. Kamins' fifth point is of particular interest. One of the original goals of the Institute had been to use the experience as the basis for planning a specialized minor within the GSLS curriculum. Dr. Kamins'

report comments:

> "From all the evidence available to me, the experience has been sufficiently valuable to the participants to justify this curricular development. It would be enriching to the curriculum of the School of Library Studies to add this inter-disciplinary option, utilizing a block of students' time, to its regular course offerings."

III. Cross-Cultural Training Evaluation

Dr. Jaeckle (and his colleague Dr. David who worked on the first semester evaluation) were not cross-cultural trainers but had been working with the CCCTR (since re-named Cross-Cultural Center, Inc.) as evaluation consultants. They had previously evaluated the CCCTR's work with teachers, county workers, and other groups, and - in this case - were looking to see how successful cross-cultural training might be with librarians.

Although critical of some techniques used by the trainers and of the trainers' possible over-emphasis on spontaneity and under-emphasis on planning, Dr. Jaeckle's report concluded that the cross-cultural training component of the Institute was quite successful. Not only did the trainers adapt themselves well to the needs of librarians, the librarians responded quite favorably to the "experiential" approach and the use of interpersonal group training techniques.

Of particular value to most participants were the two intensive group learning sessions which involved all three of the cross-cultural trainers -- the four-day pre-Institute introductory session in August of 1971, and the two-day wrap-up session in May of 1972. The first session served to break the ice and to introduce a strong group spirit and a spirit of trust. The last session reinforced this spirit in a very positive way. Dr. Jaeckle felt that possibly this type of experiential learning and interpersonal communication training might be especially valuable to librarians. He commented:

> "One frequently hears how interpersonal relationships are difficult for the stereotypic 'shy librarian'. To the extent that this difficulty exists, the people from CCCTR will have a contribution to make to the librarians of Hawaii."

Staff Self-Evaluation

At the conclusion of the Institute, after reviewing the formal and informal evaluations provided by participants and outside evaluators, the directors were able to identify certain apparent strengths and apparent weaknesses of the Institute as well as the major problems which had been encountered.

I. Apparent Strengths of the Institute

Without doubt, the greatest strength of the Institute was its provision of a strong supportive group to which individuals could relate -- as librarians, as students, and as individuals. In effect, the strength of the Institute was in the participants themselves -- a group of highly motivated and dedicated people who were able to support one another and work together in a group learning experience.

What the Institute structure did was provide a time and a place for group interaction, provide speakers and films and learning materials to stimulate discussion, and provide as facilitative a learning environment as possible. There was no real teaching in the Institute; there was only learning. Participants and staff learned together.

The provision of group support was important to the various participants in varying ways. For the five people flown in from the neighbor islands each Saturday, there was a special poignancy in the experience. Normally cut off -- by the high cost of interisland transportation -- from the expanded professional and personal contacts available on the island of Oahu, the neighbor islanders not only gained significantly from the weekly contacts with the rest of the State, but also brought a fresh perspective to the discussions of Oahu librarians.

In general, the working librarians gained from the chance to talk to fellow librarians off the job and away from job-related anxieties. For school librarians this was perhaps especially important, since normally their contacts with other librarians tended to be limited. The facilitation of interchange among different types of librarians -- school, public, and college -- as well as between librarians and library school students -- was also a significant strength of the Institute.

The group support of the Institute served the working librarians as a sort of revitalizing morale builder. For the students, the support -- plus the fact that the Institute made up one-third of their library school credit hours -- provided a kind of coherent and synthesized perspective not always possible in the usual segmented and more competitive library school program.

Another strength of the Institute was its provision of a wide variety of contacts with both ideas and people from other professions, other academic disciplines, and other community agencies. These interdisciplinary contacts not only provided important learning experiences, they also provided both librarians and library school faculty with a means of establishing better relationships with various communitites.

A third major strength of the Institute was its extensive evaluation program -- not because the mass of evaluation data collected really "proved" anything one way or another about the Institute, but because the careful and continuous attention to self-evaluation facilitated self-awareness on the part of both participants and staff. The fact that the evaluation program involved considerable input from participants and considerable interchange between participants and staff seemed

also to provide the positive benefits of the so-called "Hawthorne effect". Participants were persuaded that what happened to them was important, that they had a contribution to make, that others were concerned with their ideas and problems and progress.

Some of the evaluation survey forms were unsuccessful or too structured for some participants, but the over-all effect of the evaluation program (especially the emphasis on participant involvement and self-evaluation) was supportive and contributed to the success of the Institute.

II. Apparent Weaknesses of the Institute

The most obvious weakness of the Institute was in the area of field experiences. Although participants were, in general, convinced that they had learned a lot from the experiences, clearly there could have been more and better opportunities for learning presented to the participants. This weakness was directly related to two other weaknesses in the program. First, for a number of reasons which will be discussed further below, the Social Work faculty never became fully integrated into or fully involved with the Institute program. And second, the needs of the full-time students and of the working librarians were so different that it was difficult to develop a single program which would adequately serve both groups at all times.

Clearly there was not enough time for planning and for both formal and informal communication between the Institute staff and the Social Work professors. The Institute Director was teaching two courses in addition to the six-hour Institute and the senior Social Work professor was committed to an exceedingly heavy schedule of teaching and other professional activity. The Assistant Director of the Institute and the junior Social Work professor made a valiant attempt to keep things from getting uncoordinated, but they were not completely successful. There was simply not enough interchange among all four of the people involved.

There was also not enough interchange between the Institute participants and the Social Work staff. As was noted in the participants' comments above, participants were made to feel that they were "imposing" on the Social Work professors' time. The Institute Assistant Director was forced to act as a sort of middle-man running between the participants and the busy professors. This really over-complicated the coordination of the field experiences. There were simply too many people and too many steps between the participants and their contacts in the field.

A further complication was the fact that the needs of the various participants varied so widely -- as did the amount of time they were able to devote to field work. For the working librarians, who were already putting in a six-day week with the Institute classes all day Saturday, and who were -- for the most part -- unable to get time off from work for field projects, extensive field experiences were hardly feasible. Students, on the other hand, had more flexible schedules but had no library neighborhood or real-life library problem to which they could relate the experience. For some students, getting experience in a <u>library</u> was much more important (i.e. met more immediate

needs) than getting experience elsewhere in the community.

Throughout the Institute program there was a problem with the fact that the full-time students (especially those who had no library experience) had no library to relate anything to -- no frame of reference. It was definitely a weakness of the Institute that special compensation for this (e.g. more formal involvement of students with working participants in their libraries) was not built into the program.

Students were in the minority (only one-third of the group), had no libraries of their own, were not federally supported (as they were taking other library school courses and so were not in the Institute exclusively), and had special needs which were not always met. As was noted above, it was a student who lashed out at the Institute in the narrative evaluation for being merely "nine months of blabbing about the poor."

A particular need of the full-time students, which might have been met more adequately, was the need for job-placement at the conclusion of the Institute. A placement component should have been written into the design of the program and was not. The result was that graduates with a needed competency were not very effectively connected with libraries where they might have been needed.

An additional weakness of the Institute was its failure to involve or reach the colleagues and supervisors of the participants (and the staff) in a really significant way. Part of the reason the group experience was so supportive may have been that the group did not allow itself to be confronted by those "outsiders" who might have been most threatening.

Greater involvement of those "outsiders" might have facilitated greater filtering of Institute impact from the participants themselves to their separate worlds outside the Institute -- as well as greater impact of Institute innovations on the regular library school curriculum.

There was by no means a total failure to reach "outsiders" but efforts in this direction could have been more substantial. Perhaps the most significant contribution was made by the group of ten full-time Institute students, who -- distressed by the gulf between the Institute and the rest of the library school -- organized a very successful off-campus get-acquainted session for Institute participants and staff, other library school students and faculty, and any other interested librarians.

In addition, visiting mainland speakers gave special presentations which were shared with the total library (and library school) community and all Institute sessions were open to those librarians, students, or faculty who requested to be included. On only a few occasions, however, did library or library school personnel outside the Institute actively participate in the program. There should have been more of such active participation by "outsiders".

III. Major Problems Encountered

Probably the most serious problem encountered was the lack of lead time -- for planning, for recruiting participants, for recruiting speakers and consultants, and for scheduling what was to be a very complicated and multi-faceted program. There was barely enough time between the acceptance of the library school's letter of intent and the deadline for the proposal in which to line up all of the possible alternatives -- let alone set up a firm program plan. Later, the time between the final acceptance of the plan of operation (and awarding of the grant) and the start of the program was not sufficient to do a really adequate job of recruiting and scheduling.

The Institute staff was left with the unhappy task of trying to recruit participants and speakers at the end of the summer, when most people were on vacation and very difficult to reach. The planning problems with the School of Social Work began at this point. Heavily committed to other activities, the two Social Work professors were not available for pre-Institute conferences at all. (In fact, they were not available for a conference with the Institute Director until nearly the end of the first semester.)

Many of the weaknesses of the Institute might be traced back to this initial problem -- lack of adequate time for planning and preparation.

Another problem encountered at the outset of the Institute was some difficulty with the State Department of Education over whether school and/or public librarians might attend an Institute during working hours or receive compensatory time-off for Institute attendance after working hours. The difficulty arose, in part, because of the very recent introduction of collective bargaining to the public employment scene in Hawaii.

In the end, the Institute sessions -- originally scheduled for Wednesdays -- had to be rescheduled for Saturdays, since school librarians were prohibited from attending during school hours and there was some question about how many (if any) public librarians might receive time-off to attend.

Public librarian participants who were scheduled to work some Saturdays (e.g. one Saturday a month) did receive compensatory time-off for those Saturdays. However, they were not permitted to accept stipends for those weeks. All of the school librarian participants, as well as those public librarians not scheduled for Saturday work, attended the Institute on their own time and received no compensatory time-off.

An additional problem arose at the end of the Institute, when the school librarian participants were denied personal leave to attend the final session which had to be held on a Monday. (Public librarians were permitted compensatory time-off.) The school librarians elected to attend the session and contest the Department of Education's decision through their union, the Hawaii State Teachers Association. After some months, the union won a re-clarification on personal leave from the

DOE, and the school librarians were reimbursed for the salary they had lost.

These problems underscore the difficulty involved in establishing any kind of continuing education program for public employees at this time. They also illustrate some of the reasons for the ill-will that exists between this state's school librarians and public librarians -- both groups under the same State department, but each group treated separately and differently.

One of the significant outcomes cited frequently by Institute participants was, in fact, the gaining of understanding by school librarians of public librarians' problems and vice versa. There is a real need for more interchange between these groups.

The other major problem encountered was discussed briefly above under "Apparent Weaknesses of the Institute" -- the problem of designing and implementing a program to suit both working librarians and full-time students. Actually, we regarded this as a challenge rather than a problem, because we believed that the two groups had much to offer to each other. The formal and informal evaluations of student and working librarian participants seemed to indicate that our efforts were worth whatever difficulties we encountered, as the two groups did -- in the end -- value the experience of learning together.

What could be done to alleviate or avoid the above problems in future Institutes? Probably the kinds of problems cited above will never be avoidable. However, they certainly could be made less severe and less troublesome by planning and implementing a shorter and less extensive Institute.

Six-Month Follow-Up Evaluation

In November, 1972, six months after the conclusion of the Institute, a follow-up evaluation was conducted by Dr. Walter Jaeckle, Consulting Psychologist for Cross-Cultural Center, Inc.

The complete text of Dr. Jaeckle's report appears in Appendix C. A brief summary and commentary follows below.

By means of questionnaires and interviews with Institute participants and with supervisors of working participants, Dr. Jaeckle attempted to assess the impact of the Institute as perceived by participants and supervisors. In addition, he solicited their opinions on the importance of the Institute's goals in training librarians and their recommendations for continuing education for librarians. Questionnaires were also sent to controls -- public, college, and school librarians, and library school students and graduates -- who had not participated in the Institute.

In general, both participants and supervisors expressed satisfaction with the Institute and perceived learning in the areas of understanding

other people, group dynamics, and interpersonal communication.

One of the follow-up questionnaires asked participants and controls to indicate how much they had changed, during the Institute year, in ten behavioral areas corresponding to Institute goals. Supervisors of participants were asked to indicate how much they felt their employees had changed in the ten areas. This questionnaire uncovered some interesting differences between participants and controls, as well as between student and practitioner respondents.

First, both participants and their supervisors indicated changes of greater magnitude than did controls. Rating their change on a five-point scale, controls rated themselves between points three and four (between "No Change" and "Somewhat More") in all ten areas. Participants rated their changes between points four and five (between "Somewhat More" and "Much More") in eight of the ten areas. Supervisors rated participants' changes between points four and five for all ten areas. (See Appendix D for table of mean scores for all groups.)

One of the areas in which participants perceived least increase was in feeling "comfortable with the role of librarian." Controls, on the other hand, found this an area of greatest increase. Students -- both participant and control -- found a much greater increase in this area than did practitioners. Doubtless this reflects the fact that one of the chief tasks of library school is the socialization of new members into the profession. It is of interest, however, that student participants rated themselves as less comfortable with the role of librarian than did student controls.

Much of the Institute was concerned with re-evaluation of the traditional role of the librarian in society. Apparently this emphasis was successfully unsettling.

As one participant commented:

> "To be perfectly honest, I feel somewhat less comfortable with the role of librarian at the present time because as a result of the Institute I have tried to expand my scope of operation by stepping out of my familiar environment into the larger neighborhood community of disadvantaged people ... As I become more accustomed to this new role of mine, I believe I shall regain my confidence as a librarian."

Another area in which there was a significant difference between participants and controls was in "considering it important to think of myself and others as products of our respective cultures." This had been an explicitly stated goal of the Institute and it was one of the areas in which participants perceived greatest increase. Controls, on the other hand, saw themselves as closer to "No Change" in this area.

Not all items on the questionnaire revealed great differences between participants and controls. For example, participants, controls, and supervisors all saw the greatest increase in the area of being "aware of ways libraries can cooperate with other agencies in social action programs."

In addition, there was a fair amount of unanimity in answers to questions about continuing education for librarians. When asked "What particular skills do you still need to acquire to perform better as a librarian?" -- participants and controls (as well as supervisors of participants) responded with a number of specific recommendations. Technical library skills (cataloging, information retrieval, etc.), media skills, communication skills, and administrative skills were listed by all groups.

Perhaps the most telling exhibition of unanimity was in answer to the question: "How do you think you could best acquire any skills that you still may need?" Given a choice of "Library school training," "On-the-job training," "On my own," or "Some other way," most respondents answered "On-the-job training."

Thus the follow-up study seemed to indicate that, although the Institute was judged a success by its participants and their supervisors -- and did produce some significant changes in participants, neither participants nor non-participants regard ■ library school training in general as the best method of continuing education for librarians.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In human terms, the Institute for Training in Librarianship -- "The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society" -- was certainly a success. Every one of the thirty-one participants finished the full two-semester program. At the conclusion of the second semester and again six months later, the concensus of the group was quite positive. Both participants and supervisors of participants believed that significant learning had taken place. Various outside evaluators agreed. In general, the Institute seemed to have achieved its participant learning goals -- the development among participants of greater cultural understanding, greater skill in cross-cultural communication, increased self-awareness, and an increased awareness of new roles for self and for the library in society.

In academic terms, the Institute was probably less successful. One of the original goals of the Institute had been: "To use the program as the basis for developing a specialized minor within the library school curriculum." Although the outside evaluator who examined the academic aspects of the program recommended that such an interdisciplinary minor would be "enriching" to the library school curriculum, there is no indication that the significant aspects of the Institute will be incorporated into the curriculum in the form of a minor.

Significant Aspects of the Institute

A review of the significant aspects of the Institute suggests why their incorporation into the library school curriculum might pose a few problems.

First, the Institute offered what the academic program evaluator referred to as "an alternative" within the curriculum -- a large block of time, one-third of the total required thirty-six hours, devoted to an interdisciplinary group learning experience utilizing an approach that contrasted sharply with the rest of the school's classes.

What made this experience most significant to the participants was that the group itself not only stayed together throughout two semesters but also was enabled -- by means of group training techniques and a facilitative environment -- to develop a level of interpersonal communication and group interaction that is not normally achieved in a classroom.

Furthermore, the group itself was an exceptional collection of very highly motivated people, selected for their dedication to or interest in the theme of the Institute. It was also a heterogeneous group -- including both students and working librarians and representing a diversity of ages, ethnic groups, and social and geographic backgrounds.

These participants knew that they were a special group of people in a special experimental program and that educators and librarians

in Hawaii and in Washington were interested in what happened to them. They were encouraged to participate in goal-setting, program planning, and evaluation throughout the Institute so that the Institute would meet their individual needs.

As far as the "content" of the Institute was concerned, the significant aspects seemed to be 1) the opportunity to hear and meet representatives from so many different academic disciplines and social agencies, and 2) the chance to get outside the library (for the working participants) and outside the library school (for the students) and get some experience in the community.

To incorporate all of the above aspects into the curriculum in the form of a minor, would require considerable curricular and administrative upheaval. Furthermore, there are strong indications that working librarians -- who compromised two-thirds of the Institute group -- either would not participate again in such an extensive program or do not believe that library school is the best place to learn what they need to know. In the follow-up survey of participants and controls, only two out of sixty-four respondents cited library school as the place where they could best learn needed skills. Nearly everyone indicated that on-the-job training would be more appropriate.

Implications for Future Institutes or Training Programs

The participation of students and a variety of working librarians in a single program was definitely a most valuable aspect of the Institute. However, future programs should probably involve less time on campus and more time in the field.

Since students almost universally expressed a need for practical field experience and librarians almost universally expressed a need for on-the-job training, it would seem that a program involving both students and librarians in libraries rather than in the classroom might be appropriate. However, such a program would be so diffuse that it would eliminate what appeared to be the chief benefit of the Institute -- the development of learning and self-awareness within a cohesive and supportive group.

Probably some kind of compromise would be most appropriate. A two-semester program might be planned in which students and practicing librarians met in the classroom for some group work during the first semester -- with some student visits to practitioners' libraries, and -- during the second semester -- students worked with practitioners in their libraries, with two or three group sessions in the library school. Group sessions might involve lectures and panel discussions as well as special training techniques.

The experiential learning and group training techniques utilized by the Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research are definitely worth

including in any Institute or training program. The work of the CCCTR trainers was a major factor in the success of this Institute.

Certainly any future program should also involve, as much as possible, the participation of lecturers and panelists from other academic disciplines and other social agencies. However, joint sponsorship of a program with another professional school -- such as was attempted by this Institute during its second semester -- should not be undertaken without a lot of pre-planning.

Summary

The participants and staff of this Institute for Training in Librarianship felt that they learned a lot from it. It was regarded by everyone involved as an enriching human experience. Whether this learning and experience will make any difference to libraries, or library education, or our pluralistic society, remains to be seen.

Perhaps the best estimate of the Institute's impact is the evaluation written by a participant on the last of day of the program:

> "I believe that all participants are bound 'to make some waves' -- not a tidal wave, which is abrupt and short in duration, but more like ripples and gentle surf which are constantly and continually washing ashore ..."

APPENDIX A

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

ROSTER OF STAFF, SPEAKERS,

AND CONSULTANTS

University of Hawaii
Institute for Training in Librarianship

The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society: Cross-Cultural Training for Social Action

ROSTER OF
PARTICIPANTS

A. Practitioners

Fujimoto, Hiroko
505 Kekupua St.
Honolulu, HI 96825
Employment: Kalakaua Intermediate School, Honolulu

Fujita, Miriam
2533 Gardenia St.
Honolulu, HI 96816
Emp.: Jarrett Intermediate School, Honolulu

Fujita, Taeko
2653 Oahu Ave.
Honolulu, HI 96822
Emp.: Royal Elementary School, Honolulu (on sabbatical '71/'72)*

Green, Sister Gladys
St. John Convent
2330 Omilo Ln.
Honolulu, HI 96819
Emp.: St. John School, Honolulu

Henderson, Patricia
158 Simon Ave.
APO San Francisco 96553
Emp.: Waianae Branch Library, Waianae
Now: Full-time Library School student

Hoffman, Sylvia [now: Ginoza, Sylvia (Hoffman)]
2049 Oswald St.
Honolulu, HI 96816
Emp.: Windward Bookmobile (Oahu)

Koseki, Jane
1244 Makalapua Pl.
Honolulu, HI 96817
Emp.: Ft. Shafter Elementary School, Honolulu

Krueger, Carol
85-768 Piliuka Pl.
Waianae, HI 96792
Emp.: Waianae High School, Waianae

Lindley, Samuel
2115 Armstrong St.
Honolulu, HI 96822
Emp.: Honolulu Community College, Honolulu

Manoi, Viola
P. O. Box 56
Kalaheo, HI 96741
Emp.: Kalaheo Elementary School (Kauai)
Now: Eleele School (Kauai)

Miller, Dorothy
Box 731
Wailuku, HI 96793
Emp.: Bookmobile (Maui)

Mitsunaga, Sylvia
P. O. Box 733
Lanai City, HI 96763
Emp.: Lanai Elementary & High School (Lanai)

Mori, Etsuko
311 Anela St.
Hilo, HI 96720
Emp.: Waiakea Elementary School (Hilo, Hawaii)

Nakamura, Hanako
1325 Wilder Ave., Makai 15
Honolulu, HI 96822
Emp.: Outreach Librarian, State Library, Honolulu

Nott, Nancy
2533 Malama Pl.
Honolulu, HI 96822
Emp.: Liliha Branch Library, Honolulu

Roffman, Marian
6206 Miloli'i Pl.
Honolulu, HI 96825
Emp.: Hawaii Pacific College, Honolulu
Now: University of Hawaii

Scott, Barbara
210 Noe St.
Kihei, HI 96753
Emp.: Maui Community College (Maui)
Now: Kauna Olu College (Maui)

Teramoto, Setsuko
2964 Keoni St.
Honolulu, HI 96814
Emp.: Kalihi-Waena School, Honolulu

Truitt, Deborah
Rt. 3
Box 60 A
Gainesville, Florida 32601
Emp.: University of Hawaii Undergraduate Library, Honolulu
Now: Unemployed

Uyechi, Amy
2420 Hoohoihoi St.
Pearl City, HI 96782
Emp.: Ilima Intermediate School, Ewa Beach

Yee, Florence
1118 9th Ave.
Honolulu, HI 96816
Emp.: Leeward Bookmobile (Oahu)

B. Students*

Buckingham, Lewis
22 S. 41st St.
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104
Emp.: Free Library of Philadelphia

Huston, Mary
Route 5
Brainerd, Minn. 56401
Emp.: AAUP/UHFA Alliance, University of Hawaii

Mealor, Elizabeth [nee: Madsen, Elizabeth]
901 2nd Ave.
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
Emp.: Fairbanks (Alaska) Public Library

Menton, Linda
98-142 Lipoa Pl.
#203 B
Aiea, HI 96701
Emp.: Nanaikapono Elementary School, Nanakuli

Mitchell, Sylvia
45-850 E. Luana Pl.
Kaneohe, HI 96744
Emp.: Full-time Library School student

Parise, Pierina
707 Palmer Ct., No.
Mamaroneck, N.Y.
Emp.: ACTION (Peace Corps) Volunteer - Public Library,
Lautoka, Fiji

Rogers, Linda
3725 Oro Bangor Hwy.
Oroville, Ca. 95965
Emp.: Butte County (California) Library

Sugimura, Sue
4110 Puumalu Pl.
Honolulu, HI 96816
Emp.: Full-time Library School student (graduating December)

Tanioka, Sandra
846 C Makahiki Way
Honolulu, HI 96816
Emp.: East-West Center Communications Institute, University of
Hawaii (pending BOR approval in January, 1973)

Wright, Leona
3006 D St., #5
Sacramento, Ca. 95816
Emp.: McKinley Branch, Sacramento (Calif.) City-County Library

*The one school librarian on sabbatical leave and the ten students were not federally supported.

University of Hawaii
Institute for Training in Librarianship

The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society: Cross-Cultural Training for Social Action

ROSTER OF STAFF,
SPEAKERS, AND CONSULTANTS

A. Staff

1. Graduate School of Library Studies

Dr. Joyce H. Haas, Institute Director

Ms. Katherine A. Kreamer, Institute Assistant Director

2. Cross-Cultural Training Specialists

Mr. William E. Brenneman
Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research

Dr. James F. Downs
Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research

Mr. Stuart Kearns
Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research

3. Graduate School of Social Work

Ms. Marjorie Morris, Assistant Professor

Dr. Mildred Sikkema, Professor

B. Speakers and Panelists

1. First Semester

Dr. Stuart Gerry Brown, Professor, American Studies

Dr. Elizabeth Carr, Professor Emeritus, Speech

Ms. Diana Chang, Head, Social Science Reference, Hamilton Library

Dr. Thomas M. C. Chang, Associate Professor, Educational Psychology and Director of Hawaii Upward Bound

Mr. Jack Dalton, Director, Library Development Center, Columbia University

Mr. Reuel Denney, Professor, American Studies

Ms. Jeannine Dunwell, Instructor, School of Nursing

Dr. Michael L. Forman, Assistant Professor, Linguistics

Dr. Robert Harrison, Research Associate, Population Institute

Mr. Mark Helbling, Acting Assistant Professor, American Studies

Dr. Joseph Hight, Assistant Professor, Economics

Dr. Seymour Lutzky, Professor and Chairman, American Studies

Dr. James McCutcheon, Associate Professor, History and American Studies

Dr. Helge Mannson, Associate Professor, Psychology

Dr. Minako Maykovich, Associate Professor, Sociology

Dr. Dennis M. Ogawa, Director, Ethnic Studies

Dr. Richard Rapson, Director, University of Hawaii New College

Dr. Thomas Shaughnessy, Director, Dana Library and Associate Professor of Library Service, Rutgers University

Mr. Kenneth Shigekawa, Assistant, Ethnic Studies

Dr. Michael Weinstein, Assistant Professor, Sociology

2. Second Semester

Ms. Camille Almy, Program Specialist, Teacher Assist Center

Mr. John F. Anderson, Director, San Francisco Public Library

Ms. Genevieve Casey, Associate Professor, Department of Library Science, Queens College

Ms. Nina Collins, Welfare Recipients Advisory Council

Dr. Edith Doi, University of Hawaii Community Colleges, Coordinator, Institutional Research

Dr. Cecil Dotts, Community Service Volunteer

Dr. Hardy Franklin, Assistant Professor, Department of Library Science, Queens College

Ms. Donna Garcia, Director, State Library Services

Ms. Jane Giddings, Hawaii Council for Housing Action

Mr. Royce Higa, Executive Director, Honolulu Community Action Program

Ms. Winifred Ishimoto, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Social Work

Ms. Mildred Johansen, Human Services Worker

Ms. Nancy Kickertz, Graduate Student, School of Social Work

Mr. George Lee, State Liaison to Model Cities

Ms. Lydia Ranger, Librarian, State Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped

Dr. Daniel Sanders, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work

Mr. Louis Stibbard, Education Officer, Hawaii Job Corps

Mr. Edward Wake, Health and Community Services Council

Ms. Jewel Walton, Research and Development Librarian, Woodbridge Public Library, New Jersey

Dr. Elizabeth Wittermans, Associate Professor, Human Development

Mr. Charles Wothke, Director, Human Services Center

C. Consultants

Dr. Herbert H. Aptekar, Dean, University of Hawaii Graduate School of Social Work, Consultant for Social Work Planning

Ms. Linda Engelberg, University of Hawaii Library, Consultant on University Resources for Innovative Programs

Dr. Gerald M. Meredith, University of Hawaii Evaluation Officer, Consultant on Evaluation

Dr. Edward T. Schofield, University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies, Consultant on Educational Media and Instructional Resources

Mr. Yukihiro Suzuki, University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies, Consultant on Selection of Library Materials

APPENDIX B

OUTSIDE EVALUATION REPORTS

PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY TRAINING EVALUATION
INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING IN LIBRARIANSHIP
"THE LIBRARIAN IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY"

Report by: Ruth S. Itamura
Acting Director
Public Libraries Branch
Hawaii State Library

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM

The LS 693 and LS 696 courses were not only timely, but also practical experimental programs. The institute generated a pivoting movement, bringing to focus relevant dimensions/needs of librarians working in today's multi-faceted, cross-cultural society.

The flexible programming was supported by qualified professionals in different disciplines. The strength, as this observer saw it, was the composition of the class itself: the interaction provoked by a cross-section of graduate students, practicing public and school librarians, the young and not-so-young and the representation of cultures.

The occasional grouping of "like" practitioners for discussions, tended to create reactions akin to a gripe session and polarization. However, others succeeded and were motivated to dissect their self-centered concerns and emerge into cooperative group experience.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. That the public librarians became aware (or more aware) of the need to develop cultural understanding is evidenced by their sustained interest and year-long attendance. However, the introductions to and the contacts established with key representatives of community and social action programs were particularly helpful and vital for future development of grass-roots programming.

2. The institute assisted in developing a sensitivity to and respect for other people's rights: to learn to listen and gain an understanding for the total need to communicate.

3. The techniques of surveys, planning and evaluation were especially pertinent for the public librarians. These broader implications of and the effects of social forces in communication were very meaningful to the practitioners.

An academic introduction to and an awareness of this pluralistic society have been established. The seminars and projects enabled the participants to search for, to relate to, and to develop a practicum. However, follow-up, specificity and in-depth programs will bring about another needed dimension in working with the disadvantaged. Some suggested ideas are:

An overview of cultures: explore needs, prescribe and develop specific resource tools and program ideas (by ethnic groups).

Develop a multi-media presentation for use with the new American citizen.

Plan a neighborhood center (site location, staffing, materials and resources, programs).

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION
1971-72 INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING IN LIBRARIANSHIP:
"The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society"

Report by: Robert M. Kamins, Ph.D.
Professor of Economics
University of Hawaii

BASIS OF EVALUATION

The following evaluation is based upon observation of several sessions of the Institute between December 1971 and May 1972; conversations with participants, some of the lecturers, the director and assistant director of the program; inspection of participants' evaluations made over the course of the year and at the conclusion of the Institute.

SETTING OF INSTITUTE WITHIN GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL

The MLS program offered by the Graduate School of Library Studies of the University of Hawaii is a solid one -- strong in the principles of librarianship and in the methods of operating libraries -- but also rather conventional in the sense that the curriculum is divided into three-credit courses and that it is self-contained within the College; i.e. there are no connections with other divisions of the University of Hawaii, unless they are made individually by faculty members within their own courses. The core curriculum, normally requried of all Master's candidates, consists of seven courses, one of which considers the social functions of libraries and another the services provided to readers. The core makes up about two-thirds of the MLS program, leaving the student a choice of three to five electives (they are limited for those intending to be school, children's or young adults' librarians), chosen from a score of possible electives--all within the School, unless special arrangements are made. To judge from the catalog descriptions of these electives, only two are directed to the social setting and functioning of libraries. These are LS 693, Special Topics in Librarianship, which lists a discussion of library service to the disadvantaged as an example of what may be covered, and LS 696, the field seminar in librarianship which serves as the practice teaching course for school librarians. Both of these courses were used as the formal academic vessels for the Institute.

PROGRAM GOALS

The proposal which led to the funding of the Institute said that its basic aim was to train people in developing library services for the disadvantaged in the community, and to use the program -- if successful -- as the basis for planning a new minor within the Master's curriculum of

the School of Library Studies. The operational goals of the Institute were stated to be the development by the participants of "an understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings"; their learning techniques of cross-cultural communication; their familiarization with "the many social agencies and social programs within their communities"; learning techniques by which libraries can cooperate with other social agencies; and enabling the participants to "set their own goals within this context [of providing library services for disadvantaged groups not now served[and help develop a program to meet these goals."

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Thirty-one persons were accepted as participants in the program: 10 students enrolled in the Graduate School of Library Studies and 21 practicing librarians -- 11 from school libraries, 6 from public libraries and 4 college librarians. Nineteen were accepted from Oahu, 6 from other islands of this state and 6 applied from as many states of the mainland. All but two were women. Ages ranged from 21 to 66. Remarkably, all participants who enrolled in August 1971 completed the nine-month program.

ACADEMIC RECOGNITION

Participants were given their choice of enrolling for two courses carrying graduate credit of six hours each semester, of taking them as special in-service training courses not carrying graduate credit, or of auditing the courses. Those completing both semesters for credit thereby fulfilled approximately one-third of the MLS program.

TRAINING TECHNIQUES

The Institute utilized a variety of teaching-training approaches and techniques over its span of the academic year. Even before the first semester began, faculty of the University's Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research were brought in to stimulate and open communication among the participants, who for the most part knew each other only formally, if at all. This was repeated at intervals over the year. In the process, the CCCTR faculty demonstrated techniques for penetrating the normal barriers between people and sensitizing them as to their behaviour towards others-- such as role-playing, games, video-taping group interaction-- which were employed in meetings of the Institute. An important by-product was to help the 31 individuals who enrolled in the Institute to form a group, a social arrangement which seldom occurs in the classroom and one which at least some of the participants were to find supportive over the course of the year.

Once the semester began, the Saturday schedule generally presented lecture discussions or panel discussions in the morning sessions and

group discussions among the participants in the afternoon-- sometimes joined by the faculty members or others making the morning presentations, sometimes augmented by a film or tape. In the first semester the lectures or discussions were largely presented by members of the University of Hawaii faculty, drawn from a wide range of the social sciences, plus two interdisciplinary programs in the humanities, and from the Schools of Social Work, Nursing, and Library Studies (including the director of the Institute), and from the staff of the University Graduate library. Two directors of University library programs on the mainland spoke to, and with, the group.

There were more mainland speakers in the second semester, when discussion focussed more specifically on disadvantaged groups in American society and means of providing them with library services. In the second semester there was also sustained a participation by two faculty members of the School of Social Work in discussing field work projects required of each participant taking the Institute courses for credit. Twenty-three of the 31 participants undertook field projects intended to familiarize them with groups within the community facing problems of poverty, physical handicap, drug addiction, etc., and with the social agencies working with these groups. There were more sessions with CCCTR people at intervals during the second semester to further display and apply cross-cultural communication techniques, and a final two-day meeting to help bring together the experiences of the year, which also included attendance at the Spring meetings of Hawaii's associations of librarians. Evaluation, which in one form or another was a weekly function within the Institute, occupied the entire working day of its final session.

OUTCOMES

By any likely criteria, the Institute was a success. As an academic process, it retained the participation of all the participants-- 31 signed up for the program, 31 completed it: 23 for credit and 8 as auditors.

The attempt to create an interdisciplinary curriculum apparently worked rather well in most respects. Written and oral opinions of the participants indicated that most of them appreciated and enjoyed the range of the dialogs they heard, and in varying degrees engaged in, concerning the society, the community and some of the agencies serving disadvantaged groups. ("The traditional courses are too limited" was one written opinion.) Over half of the written evaluations by participants indicated satisfaction that they had achieved a broader understanding of the functioning of libraries within society, particularly in reaching groups presently isolated. Several volunteered in their written comments that they had gained a better understanding of themselves, as people and in their profession. One response was highly critical of the focus of the Institute ("nine months of blabbing about 'the poor'")-- but this was the only one.

Opinions concerning the contributions of the many disciplines invited into the colloquy varied, but an overwhelming majority was favorable for most portions of the classroom activity. Most frequently criticized-- though by no means universally-- was the participation of a faculty member from the School of Social Work. In part, the criticisms were connected with the field work experience, in which there had been an expectation that the Social Work faculty would be more deeply engaged in making initial connections with the groups or agencies the participants picked to study, or in proceeding with the project.

Nevertheless, there was generally a favorable reaction to the field work experience expressed in the participants' evaluations, in which the contact people at the various agencies as well as the director of the Institute concurred. (That there was some leakage was evidenced by the response of one of the contact people, who answered a follow-up inquiry as to how the participant had worked with his agency by saying that there must have been some mistake, since he had not met the person named.) How meaningful the field work was to the individual participants is another question. In the opinion of the Institute's director, some of the participants were able to carry out a project which at once improved their understanding of librarianship in the community and also made a practical contribution to it-- such as the person who studied the inadequate library at Oahu prison and designed an acquisition list to meet the reading interests of the prisoners. Other participants, however, for one reason or another were less successful; some of them might have done better field work with better back-up from the Institute itself, starting with the initial contact with the agencies they were studying.

The contribution of the CCCTR to the Institute was generally highly regarded by the participants. Most of them appreciated application of sensitivity training and cross-cultural learning techniques to the central problem of the Institute-- recognizing the needs of the disadvantaged or isolated and devising ways of meeting some of them through library services-- and admired the way the techniques were used (with some reservations concerning the use of video-taping "spontaneous" discussion.) However well the demonstrations were performed, one may have some reservations as to how well the participants actually "learned" the techniques of cross-cultural communication, which was a perhaps over-ambitious goal of the program.

A demonstrable effect of the Institute was to help change social attitudes of the participants. They were given an attitudinal poll (developed by the UH Survey Research Office) before and towards the close of the Institute. Before-and-after comparisons of the replies showed that there was a general swing to more open, accepting, tolerant postures towards non-conformist social behaviour, e.g. permitting John Birchers, Communists, or homosexuals to teach in public high schools; towards the use of marijuana; in openess to people of other racial or religious groups. Since other studies have reported the same general result from higher education, and since many of the units within the

curriculum of the Institute were aimed at giving the participants a better understanding of groups outside the mainstream of American society, it is reasonable to attribute these attitudinal changes to the work of the Institute.

Another purpose of the Institute stated in the proposal for its establishment was to use its experience as the basis for planning a new minor within the MLS curriculum at the University of Hawaii. From all the evidence available to me, the experience has been sufficiently valuable to the participants to justify this curricular development. It would be enriching to the curriculum of the School of Library Studies to add to this inter-disciplinary option, utilizing a block of students' time, to its regular course offerings. Not the least of the advantages which the Institute offered was the opportunity for individual participants to form a group, thus providing mutual support, interchange of experience and opinions, and reinforcement in the learning process typically lacking in a conventional academic program. This milieu for learning may be of particular usefulness in the education of librarians, either in their pre-service training or as a part of their in-service training.

SUMMARY

1. The 1971-72 Institute of the University of Hawaii, "The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society", seems to have been quite successful, not only in retaining all 31 participants over the full academic year, but in achieving its major goals.

2. Much of its strength lies in its ability to use a block of the participants' time-- most of the time between breakfast and dinner over nine months of Saturdays-- in a multi-disciplinary examination of the subject.

3. The integration in the curriculum of people and techniques from a broad range of academic and professional activities was found to be stimulating by most participants.

4. While the selection of lecturers, discussion leaders, etc. was generally quite good, with the experience of 1971--72 improvements can be made.

5. The format and approach of the Institute can contribute a useful alternative (minor) within the curriculum of the School of Library Studies.

Robert M. Kamins
Professor of Economics
University of Hawaii

June 20, 1972

CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING EVALUATION
INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING IN LIBRARIANSHIP
"THE LIBRARIAN IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY:
CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING FOR SOCIAL ACTION"

Report by: Walter R. Jaeckle, Ph.D.
Consulting Psychologist
Cross-Cultural Center, Inc.
P. O. Box 856
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

EVALUATION OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING CONDUCTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, CENTER FOR CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING AND RESEARCH.

The purpose of this evaluation is to examine the contribution of the University of Hawaii's Center for Cross-Cultural Training and Research (CCCTR) to the goals of this Institute. CCCTR trainers were involved formally in six sessions of the Institute, and informally at social gatherings with staff and participants after some of these sessions.

The same three trainers were involved throughout both semesters of the Institute although not all three of them attended every session. Two of the trainers were of approximately the same age as the average participant, and the third was an anthropology professor of some eminence and charisma. The educational approach they used is referred to as the "experiential" approach, in which participants are put through exercises requiring them to perform some training tasks. Participants "learn by doing" in exercises including group discussions built around participants' responses to various rating instruments, games demonstrating interpersonal phenomena, role-playing of critical incidents, and video-tape playback analysis of the exercises. The topic and complexity of the exercises are adjusted to fit the concerns and past experiences of the participant group. Exercises are supplemented by lecturettes and demonstrations which offer conceptual models to account for phenomena participants experience. Total group discussions and lectures are used only occasionally.

The application of this educational approach by CCCTR to cross-cultural issues is an attempt to generate openness to a greater variety of interpersonal experiences involving ethnic differences, and familiarity with some practical concepts about cultural variation. In the terms of the long-range goals of this Institute, CCCTR directed itself toward helping participants:

> "develop an understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings and learn techniques of cross-cultural communication"

The first semester of the Institute was directed toward developing cultural understanding, and the second was directed toward developing the ability to apply this understanding to program development. Within these broad mandates, CCCTR was committed to being reactive to the current needs of the staff and participants as they unfolded during the year. Thus, descriptions written about the program before it began anticipated that the CCCTR team would be involved during the year primarily in sessions reviewing each participant's progress and revising his course objectives in light of his personal experiences. As it turned out, these functions were shared broadly with the Institute staff and other faculty; and the CCCTR team modified its role to include a greater variety of training exercises. The result was that CCCTR successfully took on a very important additional function that had not been anticipated. The Institute participants and staff came to look to CCCTR exercises to revitalize group spirit and interest when "lecture fatigue" set in. In a program as intense as this Institute, the importance of the limb-stretching quality of experiential exercises cannot be overestimated.

This evaluator did not become involved with the Institute until the second semester. By that time one of the weaknesses of CCCTR operations had had time to manifest itself. Descriptive materials and records of specific exercise adaptations and of the sequence in which they were used had not been compiled, and memories had faded considerably about what had taken place. Thus, the substantive aspect of each CCCTR session cannot be reconstructed in sufficient detail to be considered for replication in future programs. CCCTR trainers might rightfully argue that each program requires a unique experiential sequence. But until they begin to document their work with this novel educational approach, there will be no good way to develop and communicate the rules governing the uses of experiential exercises. Such documentation could be built into a training contract in the form of reimbursement for planning days.

The matter of planning for CCCTR sessions deserved a parenthetical note. Since the CCCTR team was committed to being reactive to the latest developments in the Institute, they brought upon themselves a lot of pre-session headaches. According to the trainers, they would be called only a few days before their scheduled session and briefed by the Institute staff about what had transpired since the trainer's last visit. Based on this current appraisal of Institute happenings, the trainers would then begin deciding on appropriate topics, selecting exercises and preparing instruction sheets, rating forms and whatever other material the exercises required. Preparation amounted to a considerable investment of time and energy for those CCCTR sessions featuring primarily experiential exercises, and this allowed for details to be overlooked. As a result, there seemed to be an air of panic behind the scenes of CCCTR experiential sessions, as trainers scrambled to assemble and disassemble VTR monitoring equipment, keep up with a demanding and complicated schedule and compensate for what had been overlooked or misplaced. These three CCCTR trainers

could rely upon their considerable experience to see them through, and they usually carried the sessions off with panache. From the front of the stage, one could get swept into the excitement of it all: readying for a full dress performance of a drama in which one will have a part. Participant views about how well organized the trainers were favored the belief that they knew what they were doing; e.g., after the final session a participant wrote that the sessions were "well organized and executed". Another participant who perhaps took a closer look, asked, in reference to one trainer: "Do we like him because he is as disorganized as we are?" For most participants it didn't matter how organized the trainers were. Especially the two younger trainers were credited with being sympathetic, sincere, supportive and attuned to the group.

When this evaluator visited the Institute for the first time on March 18, 1972, the impact of the CCCTR team had become established . Quite readily and generally observable were:

1. a hearty, first-name respect for the trainers from both staff and participants.

2. an almost unanimous, strongly positive feeling toward experiential exercises as the means for developing ones own interpersonal competence, coupled with

3. an almost unanimous feeling of personal gain.

4. a mild feeling of disappointment about CCCTR sessions taken up by lectures or large group discussions.

5. an informal working atmosphere in which participants willingly entered into tasks that normally evoke fear of self exposure and criticism.

Thus, it appeared that the only blemish on CCCTR's gold-star performance to date was that the general sessions, and there were two among the total of six CCCTR sessions that could be described as being almost exclusively such, were a bit "long winded" and "indoctrinary" sometimes. (Words in quotes are paraphrases of participants comments, given either verbally during sessions or in writing at the end of the Institute.) Judging from my observations and from the reputation of the senior trainer who conducted most of CCCTR's large group discussions, these sessions were at least memorable and useful. A certain amount of general dissatisfaction should be tolerated for the sake of a participant's written comment such as: "Never have I met someone whom I was more in accord with than (the senior trainer). Everything he said I felt he had taken the thoughts from my mind. I stand in awe of him." There was also widely scattered praise for the "good ideas" obtained in the general sessions.

Because the experiential exercises the CCCTR team used are described in very few places and because they appear to have had a major impact on most participants, it might be worthwhile to describe a few briefly here. This also provides the chance to examine some strengths and weaknesses of cross-cultural experiential exercises as used with these librarians.

One of the two exercises conducted Saturday morning, March 18th, is an example of a well received role-playing activity. Such activities were reacted to in writing at the end of the Institute.in terms such as "psychologically demanding", "accentuated the positive in human relations and communication while still pointing out the negatives", "loosen us up, give us self-confidence", and "most effective".

This exercise was developed in response to the information that participants were having difficulty introducing themselves at the community agencies and meetings stemming from their Institute field work. The exercise was conducted by the two younger CCCTR trainers who began by forming separate groups of the public and the school librarians. Each group consisting of approximately 10 participants was given directions for a situation constructed of interpersonal features similar to the ones they had been encountering in real life. The school librarians found themselves at a meeting of the school library parent advisory committee. The task of the central role player was to introduce herself as the school librarian and inform the parents about current library doings. The roles of three parents also were assigned: One parent came to the meeting upset because her boy had been unjustly accused of losing a book, the second parent couldn't read and was there as a favor to a friend who was the committée member, and the third felt strongly that reading books was good for children. The public librarians faced a similar role playing situation at a meeting of a community association, where the primary role player was to describe to three other participants playing community members how she might be of service to the community. Her make-believe audience of community members had been assigned roles designed to bring out typical incidents, in a manner analogous to what the school librarians were going through.

There was time alloted for each group of 10 participants to run through the exercise twice. That is, after someone had played the librarian's role for about 10 minutes, the action was stopped and the trainer led the group through an analysis of the results. Then a second participant played the librarian's role to another group of three role players. In this manner eight participants in each group had a chance to play one role or another, and everyone in the group contributed as an evaluator of the scene. Their comments were usually positively reinforcing and were always supportive.

Behind the scenes there was some fury over a lack of cooperation from the Manoa campus regarding the use of audio-visual equipment. According to the trainers, the Institute was charged a separate fee by the University for camera operators who could not perform quite simple camera applications, (so simple that this evaluator could have

acted as camera operator). Is it naive to ask why the Institute was charged additional support-services costs for cameramen? And why were some University faculty paid for instructional services while others were not? Anyway, no VTR equipment was used for playback analysis of the role playing on March 18th, and the trainers hazarded to bring their own equipment from Hilo for their final two-day session in May.

Two days out of the final three days of the Institute were devoted to CCCTR exercises, whose overall purpose was to summarize in both word and action the gains that had been made by the participants during the Institute. Even without exploiting such tools as comparisons of pre- and post-institute video tapes and with a few duds among the hits, the two days came off very well. The first exercise on Saturday was a good one, but the last on Sunday was a real dud. Three other major activities were crammed into the weekend, in addition to an explicit piece of overnight homework which had quite a few participants seeking out someone not being served by a library, and trying to come up with a program to reach him. This homework was used in large group sessions Sunday, out of which came lists of over 20 possible community activities of various magnitudes.

Saturday morning started with a repeat of an exercise conducted during the initial meeting of the Institute and is called "Why are Poor People Poor". The two younger trainers had the participants view video tapes of four persons, each reciting a distinct strong statement about the reasons for poverty. Each participant recorded on a rating form the degree to which she agreed with each statement. These forms were then discussed by the participants in small groups encharged to agree upon a single rating of each statement. In a final large-group lecturette, the process of moving toward agreement was described, and illustrated by tallies and averages from the group as they converged upon agreement. The overall message seemed modest; namely, that participants had experienced the phenomenon of agreeing upon how complex a problem poverty turns out to be when you think about it. However, to be fairly certain that the large majority of the participants knows that much at the end of the exercise is a significant improvement over our usual doubts about comprehension and retention among students. Had time allowed, the trainers might have brought in data from the first time the exercise was used, or they might have led a discussion about the cross-cultural and program development implications of the viewpoint converged upon by the group. Such elaborations were regarded by the trainers as incidental, since there was little likelihood that much of what would be said would be retained. This high regard for activity and low regard for lecture as the medium for learning is nested deep in the heart of most trainers using the experiential approach.

The last exercise on Sunday required that each participant fill out a four-item rating form on each fellow participant, telling her the extent to which the rater thought she had improved in each of four areas during the Institute. Many legitimate complaints were raised by participants, and it is a commentary on their good will that

so many of them complied by filling out a stack of rating forms. This peer-rating gimmick left room only for basically uninterpretable neutral or positive comments. The faults of instrument included:

1. some of the participants were believed to need no improvement in some of the four areas because they had a high level of skill at the start of the session. Thus if a participant received a lot of "no improvement" statements from his peers, there was no way of telling whether this meant he was was skilled or unskilled.

2. The rating form called for an appraisal of improvement over the year. Many participants felt that they didn't know each other to any notable extent until the second half of the Institute, so they had no idea of the pre-Institute "base-line" performance of their peers.

It didn't help much when the trainers insisted repeatedly that the results would not represent "truth" but only what people thought was true; and that "we realize you may get nothing from the feedback forms, but some of you may get something." The point is that if someone got something out of her peer's ratings of her it would very likely be a misinterpretation of what was intended. This would have been a serious problem if the form hadn't been designed only to collect positive and neutral feedback. Written comments from the following day suggest that participants were not able to put the ratings they received into any meaningful context.

This brief glimpse of the experiential approach at its best and worst hopefully will provide a sufficient backdrop to make some general comments about CCCTR's performance meaningful. First of all, it is quite likely that much of the warm regard felt for CCCTR from both staff and participants was directed at the two younger trainers as people. Had other, less sincere, warm and supportive trainers been in their roles the results may have been less appreciated. Nonetheless, there is still a handsome margin of recognizable intrinsic value in the exercises, even though very few exercises were milked for their academic worth by the trainers. The trainers may agree in retrospect that there were too many activities scheduled into too brief a time period. The resulting pressure and complexity of scheduling during CCCTR sessions did much to leave the trainers unnecessarily exhausted at the end of the day, and many participants were left a bit overwhelmed by it all. One participant noted that she liked CCCTR sessions because there was always so much to talk about when she got home that night. Perhaps a relaxed half-hour wrap-up at the conclusion of a session would have helped a significant number of participants to gain a similar overview of what they had been through.

If one attempted to render down to a single factor the reason for

success of CCCTR sessions, that factor probably would be the use of small groups as the medium for social learning. It is this participatory nature of the experiential learning process that makes it unusual and effective in the eyes of a vast majority of people. The enthusiasm generated by actively sharing in a participatory learning process was sufficient in this program to overshadow the "duds" among the exercises used. Probably, all but very few participants will recall CCCTR's six sessions with fondness, months and even years from now.

Judging from comments written on the final day of the Institute, there can be no question that the CCCTR experiential program was very favorably received. One participant said CCCTR's part was 3/8 of the total Institute success, (1/2 of the credit was given to the two Institute staff members). Another participant said that such an approach should take up 20% of a regular course in the University's Graduate School of Library Studies. Another felt, however, that CCCTR's offerings could have been condensed into fewer, more effective sessions. The most popular session was the first, four-day introduction to the Institute that CCCTR conducted in August. Apparently this session laid the groundwork for the rapid development of group solidarity and spirit. From those who made comments about changes over the year of the Institute the impression emerges that the effectiveness of experiential exercises diminishes somewhat as the "ice gets broken" and people get to know one another. However, the final two-day wrap-up session was the second ranking session in popularity. Thus the first and last sessions (which were, incidentally, the sessions which were the longest and which involved all three trainers), were highpoints, with a bit of a sag in between. Exceptions to this "U-shaped" curve of popularity represent the fact that various participants tend to be turned on or off by different types of sessions, no matter when in the year they occurred. Many participants seem especially turned on by role-playing and video tape playback exercises, although there was commonly an initial thrill of fear before such exercises.

A thread of boredom ran through the comments that were critical of the exercises. It may well be that the success of CCCTR's exercises depended somewhat on the degree to which participants had been exposed to such techniques before. The more likely it is that a participant was familiar with techniques such as role-playing, the more likely it is that she did not receive personal gain -- although she might comment upon the gain experienced by other participants. The novelty of the exercises is another factor in creating success with experiential exercises.

The number of written comments attributing personal gain to CCCTR exercises are in preponderance. Increase in self-confidence, understanding ones own impact on others, and seeing other people's points of view were the most frequently mentioned personal gains. These comments tend to shade over into frequent remarks about the group cohesiveness that was produced, and how the exercises helped to get people together.

Perhaps these librarians will stay in contact with one another because of the Institute. Mutual aid among these librarians in the future may provide the avenue for perpetuation of program impact. Attempts to formalize and develop these presently open communication channels should be given every encouragement, e.g. starting a periodic newsletter or holding occasional work meetings supplemented by social gatherings.

A final perspective from which to view program outcome is supplied by two roughly comparable instruments administered by the Institute staff to both the participants and their supervisors: a "Course Expectations" rating form administered before the Institute and a "Course Outcome" form administered on the final day. If the eleven items of the "Expectation" form, only two items were considered to be "extremely important" (as opposed to "moderately important", "mildly important", and "unimportant"), by a comfortably large majority of the 21 supervisors. 81% of the supervisors agreed that it was "extremely important" for their staff member to "Gain practical 'know how' for a job" during the Institute. 71% of the supervisors agreed that it was "extremely important" for their staff member to "learn to think about questions and analyze problems for himself". These two direct and practical expectations are Spartan indeed when compared to the rich and personally rewarding expectations of the participants themselves. The five items that 70% (or more) of the 21 working participants endorsed as "extremely important" at the beginning of the Institute include: "Gain an understanding of other people", "Learn to think about questions and analyze problems myself", and "Strive for excellence in my own communication". The other two expectations endorsed by a majority of participants as "extremely important" had to do with learning facts and ideas. The point is, that a combination of supervisors' and participants' wishes suggests a way to make them both happy, i.e., to give the participants a behaviour-oriented program, with enough personal realization and practical information, to increase the effectiveness of participants actions on the job. This is essentially the program attempted by CCCTR, and by the Institute as a whole. What was perhaps missing, as we shall see next, was more emphasis on transfer from the sheltered Institute to the outside world.

The "Course Outcome Survey" administered by the Institute staff on the last day of the program offers some pre-post comparisons. Applying the same criterion of significance, that 70% or more of the total group checks the item at the positive extreme of the scale, three items only emerge as course outcomes sofar as participants are concerned. Data for the supervisors were unavailable at this writing. A full 90% of the participants agreed they would definitely "advise a friend to enroll in the course next semester". 70% said they definitely increased their overall knowledge of the subject, and another 70% said they definitely have been "stimulated to strive for excellence in my own communication". This last outcome is most likely a direct measure of CCCTR impact. Dissappointingly, however, the participants were most decidely scattered in their degree of satisfaction about whether they had personally "gained practical knowledge for a job", which is one of the

two things their supervisors are looking for from the Institute. It will be interesting to see whether the supervisors perceived a change during the year in the application of new knowledge by their staff member on the job.

Getting back within stricter boundaries for evaluating the CCCTR team, and by way of concluding this report, there follows an examination of what the CCCTR team told the participants about achievements during the year. Each of the three trainers took his turn at summing up the year, and the summary that now follows combines their conclusions.

Specific reference was made to the "Why are Poor People Poor" exercise. Participants were told that the comparison of the pre- and post- Institute exercise results demonstrates that they have learned to reject simple solutions to the problem. By a process called "conformity" the group had converged upon a "complex" but "optimistic" explanation of poverty, and had become "sophisticated". No matter what else one thinks about such optimistic interpretation, it is an ego-boosting way of coaxing people to remember. This positive tone characterized all the work of the CCCTR trainers, and helps to account for the trust and openness obtained from the participants.

Along with their new "awareness of the complex", participants showed the trainers a "willingness to deal with" complexity and to "take greater risks" in order to learn. Participants wrote very similar phrases describing what they got out of CCCTR.

The participants were complemented for getting involved in the sessions and for caring about one another even when they themselves were not learning directly. This latter comment refers to the fact that when one person is "on stage" in a small group, at least some of the other group members end up as sounding boards or simply listeners.

On a more personal level, participants were seen as showing more self-confidence during sessions. The trainers observed increased self-respect and poise with regard to cross-cultural issues; as a result, they said, of new ways of conceiving old problems. For instance, interpretations are less personal and are more "systemic". The change is reflected in movement from: "How can we change <u>them</u> to use the library", to "How can we change us or the library so they will use the library". Thus participants gained poise by recognizing that they don't have control over their prospective patrons. They are relieved of any guilt, in other words, over not using special powers they might have thought their role should carry with it.

Along with increased perception into her own and others motives, the participants were described as being more able to "look at home" for the causes of interpersonal problems. Learning about how to deal with other people's perceptions of oneself probably did occur, but it certainly did <u>not</u> occur as the result of the four-item peer-rating exercise as the trainers said it did.

Finally, participants were seen as having learned through practice something about collaboration in the solution of a particular problem.

One trainer offered an overall conclusion: "No one thinks they've got it made although you think you've learned a lot".

In summary, then, participants and trainers agree fairly well upon the significant benefits accrued by CCCTR sessions. The issue of how well these benefits transfer to non-training contexts is still to be dealt with. Supervisors know what they expect from their participating staff member, and these expectations will help to shape and mold the enduring effects of the Institute, sometimes in a negative manner and sometimes in a positive one.

This Institute benefited considerably from the work of CCCTR. Thei methods deserve wider application now that it has been demonstrated how well librarians can make use of experiential learning about interpersonal and inter-ethnic communication. One frequently hears how interpersonal relationships are difficult for the stereotypic "shy librarian". To the extent that this difficulty exists, the people from CCCTR will have a contribution to make to the librarians of Hawaii.

APPENDIX C

SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION REPORT

THE LIBRARIAN IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY: CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING FOR SOCIAL ACTION

Institute for Training in Librarianship
Graduate School of Library Studies
University of Hawaii
Honolulu 96822

Report by: Walter R. Jaeckle, Ph.D.
Consulting Psychologist
Cross-Cultural Center, Inc.
P.O. Box 856
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION OF INSTITUTE IMPACT

This follow-up was conducted during the latter part of November, 1972, just six months after the conclusion of the year-long Institute. The specific purposes of the follow-up were to:

a. Comply generally with the follow-up proposed in outline form on page 42 of the Institute contract.
b. Attempt control-group comparisons and repeated administrations of a questionnaire to assess changes over the Institute year.
c. Collect representative statements from participants and their supervisors concerning:
   1. The importance of the Institute to its participants,
   2. The importance of the Institute theme in the training of librarians,
   3. Specific recommendations for career preparation and continuing education in professional librarianship.

METHODS

To accomplish these purposes, three survey questionnaires, with parallel forms to suit different respondent groups, were sent to the 21 supervisors of the working participants, and to a total of 90 control-group librarians who had had no direct contact with the Institute. The three sets of questionnaires, namely a set for participants, a set for supervisors and a set for controls, are appended to this report along with the cover letter that went with each set of questionnaires.

The control group was selected randomly from directory information. The college and public librarian controls were selected from the Directory of the Hawaii Library Association. The school librarian controls were selected from the Directory of the Hawaii Association of School Librarians. Student librarian controls were selected from the graduating

classes of the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies for May, August, September and December, 1972. Since a one-third return rate was expected from the control-group mailing, questionnaires were sent to 60 working librarians and 30 graduate sutdents. Table 1 shows the final samples used in this follow-up.

Table 1. Librarians Included in Follow-Up

	Institute Participants		Participants' Supervisors		Non-Institute Controls	
	Mailed	Returned	Mailed	Returned	Mailed	Returned
College	4	4	4	2	10	2
Public	6	5	6	5	20	10
School	11	10	11	9	30	11
Student	10	8	--	-	30	14
Actual Sample Sizes		27		16		37

In addition to mailing questionnaires, individual interviewing was accomplished with a sample of participants and their supervisors. Because Institute participants were selected originally to comprise a heterogeneous group the interview sample was selected to reflect this variety. Within each work specialty, the participants and supervisors to be interviewed were chosen by coin toss. In this manner, one out of three available college librarians, and three out of ten graduate students were selected for interviews. Two out of the four school librarians selected were included because they are situated on Neighbor Islands. The seven supervisors of the seven working librarians in the interview sample also were interviewed, for a total of 17 interviews. No control librarians were interviewed.

Each individual interview lasted about 45 minutes. Working librarians and their supervisors were interviewed separately at their work sites, and the students were interviewed at Sinclair Library on the Manoa Campus. The following questions were asked in some form during the course of each interview, although the interviewee was allowed to deviate from any suggested topic to stress his own particular concerns:

a. What attracted you to the Institute in the first place?
b. What impact did the Institute have on you?
c. Was the Institute a success?
d. What role should such institutes play in a librarian's training?
e. Is the theme of this Institute important enough to cover with all librarians?

f. What is most needed to prepare a librarian for a job setting such as yours?
g. What were the outcomes of your Institute projects?

The same questions, worded where appropriate to refer to the participant, were asked of the supervisors. The supervisors also were requested to indicate the degree of their familiarity with the Institute, and their estimate of how well information from the Institute was shared with other staff through the participant. The supervisors also were asked to estimate the amount of any change in the participant's job competence that might be attributed to the Institute.

Analyses of numerical data were accomplished using the University of Hawaii computer.[1] All written and interview data were analyzed solely by this writer.

FINDINGS

The data generated in this follow-up form an impressive mound. Most of the questionnaire respondents completed most items, and the interviewees all were verbally cooperative.

a. Numerical Results.

The three instruments used, a Reflections Questionnaire, an Expectations/Outcomes Rating Scale and a General Information blank, proved to be sufficiently sensitive to pick up reliably both general and specific information from these respondents. Numerical data from the rating scales used tend to be skewed slightly in the positive direction. This skew emerges as a significant response bias among the participants' supervisors, who are noteworthy also for being underrepresented with only 16 out of 21 supervisors responding. Possibly, supervisors with critical comments about their employees did not mail back their questionnaires, leaving only positive cases reported.

1. Reflections Questionnaire.

This instrument is intended to elicit data concerning perceived changes over the course of the Institute year. The first page consists of ten items, each on a five-point scale, which contain the stated aims of the Institute. By averaging the rating responses to each item for Participants, Supervisors, and Controls, and then ranking the items for each group on the basis of these average responses, some interesting comparisons appear. Table 2 shows these rankings for the three groups:

---

[1]Assistance in computer tabulation and analysis of follow-up evaluation data was provided by Marvin M. Nomi, Graduate Student, Department of Psychology, University of Hawaii.

Table 2. Reflections Items Ranked According to Magnitude of Average Responses

		Participants	Supervisors	Controls
Rank	1	3	3	3
	2	1	6	6
	3	6	4	2
	4	8	8	5
	5	9	7	1
	6	4	1	4
	7	7	9	8
	8	10	10	9
	9	2	5	7
	10	5	2	10

Table 2 shows that all three groups, the Participants, their Supervisors and the Controls, perceive the most improvement during the year of the Institute in terms of Items 3 and 6. These items, respectively, deal with "an awareness of ways libraries can cooperate with other agencies in social action programs," and "an awareness of the problems and conflicts involved in community and library planning." These items sound like they refer to relatively specific information, obtainable largely from day-to-day experience, and thus something encountered by all working librarians whether they are Participants or Controls. This interpretation is supported by a separate analysis of the Students' responses (see Table 3), where only Item 3 retains its prominence.

In Table 2, it can be seen that in addition to Items 3 and 6, the Participants endorse Item 1 quite strongly, indicating a notable increase in the importance they place upon thinking of themselves and others as products of their respective cultures. Since cultural pluralism was a central theme running through many sessions of the Institute, it is gratifying to find that the Participants regard this item as reflecting their personal growth, and Controls do not regard it as such. It might have been more gratifying if Supervisors also had regarded Item 1 as more reflective of growth. Item 4, however, ranks highly in the eyes of Supervisors as an area in which Participants showed conspicuous improvement. This item has to do with "self-confidence about relating to people of other socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds," which sounds like an alternate, more behavioral version of the personal, outlook-oriented aspect of Item 1.

Perhaps the most striking finding in the Reflections rating-scale items has to do with Items 2 and 5. Item 2 reads: "am comfortable with the role of librarian," and Item 5 reads: "set professional goals for myself which I fully intend to achieve." On the average, both Participants and their Supervisors perceived some slight improvement in Participants for both these areas over the course of the Institute year, although these were the areas of least gain. The Control group on the other hand, was much more inclined to perceive growth in the areas reflected by Items 2 and 5. The most likely hypothesis for explaining

these group differences seems to be that the Institute contributed to the tolerance of role ambiguity and to an awareness of how frustrating the process of goal-setting can be in light of unforeseen contingencies. As will be discussed in more detail later, one of the typical comments obtained from Participants refers to the extent to which the Institute made them happily aware of the large variety in the roles of people who share common problems as librarians. Apparently the Institute distracts attention from the construction of a cohesive but abstract professional identity, and directs attention toward increasing practical competence. Also, the typical Institute experience of having to revise original work projects no doubt helped to distract Participants from professional goal-setting to search for comfort with ambiguity.

While Participants and their Supervisors are perceiving minimal development in the Participants' professional identity and sense of direction, Controls minimize the amount of competence they developed over the year to "carry out a library program in a disadvantaged neighborhood," (Item 7). They also minimized their rate of development in another practical skill area, namely, using the behavior of others as a guide to how to respond, (Item 9).

The major effects hypothesized from the data cannot be attributed entirely to the Institute. These effects are more complexly determined, being a function also of whether the data came from practicing or student librarians. To explore the implications of this complexity, Table 3 presents item rankings for Student and Practitioner sub-samples.

Table 3. Reflections Items Ranked According to Average Ratings from Student and Practitioner Sub-Samples

	Students		Practitioners	
	Participants n=8	Controls n=14	Participants n=19	Controls n=23
Rank 1	1	2	6	3
2	3	3	3	6
3	8	5	1	4
4	2	1	8	8
5	7	8	4	9
6	9	4	5	1
7	4	7	9	2
8	5	9	10	5
9	6	6	7	10
10	10	10	2	7

With only eight Students responding from the Participant group, interpretations of Table 3 should be modest. The differences between some of the average ratings in these rankings is quite small. Identical averages are connected by an adjacent line. In order to make interpretations of these rankings it is necessary to assume that they are reliable, i.e., that the same order in the rankings would be obtained from another administration of the Reflections Questionnaire. This assumption is made here

gleefully, because the results obtained lend themselves readily to interpretations that are corroborated by the personal ovservations. Thus, the obtained numerical data are being set into an evaluative form by hopefully accurate subjective impressions.

As can be seen in Table 3, all respondents make special note of the extent to which they became aware of how libraries can cooperate in social action programs, (Item 3); and the Participants apparently have learned about cultural determinants (Items 1 and 8) from attending the Institute. More than any other respondents, the Student Controls seem to have picked up more of a sense of professional identity during the year, which makes them feel "comfortable with the role of librarian," (Item 2). This increase in comfort contrasts to that perceived by Practitioner Participants, who on the average barely perceive any improvement in this regard at all. It would reflect a nice pattern if the differences in responses to Item 2 were a product of reaching a polished professional identification at the time of graduation. There is no significant corroborating evidence for this interpretation however, in the obtained data.

It looks like that to a greater extent than is true of Practitioner respondents, the Students spent last year being concerned with clear ideas, unobscured by the many currents of daily life in a library. The graduate school process of solidifying a professional identity and sense of direction, as reflected by the responses of Student Controls to Items 2 and 5, slows down, either with attendance at last year's Institute or with some practical experience. The combination of attending the Institute and having practical experience probably does the most to diminish the quest for a solid identity, as reflected by the responses of Practitioner Participants to the same items. The responses of this latter group point toward an opposite quest, namely, a quest for tolerance of ambiguity.

One possible criticism of the hypotheses so far developed is that they are based on relative, change data, with no overall competence level for each participant to which to refer. The Reflections Questionnaire called not only for ratings on 10 change items, but also some responses to other items. Among these other items was one calling for an estimate of overall potential to contribute to the profession. Participants and Controls rated themselves and the Supervisors rated the Participants, using quartiles to indicate potential. No differences in response patterns to the 10 scaled change items can be attributed to quartile ratings. That is, it appears that over and above estimates of basic skills (whether a librarian is as competent as the top 25% in the field, etc.), the effects so far mentioned probably would emerge. Quartile ratings as a measure of perceived competence (or self-esteem perhaps), also are not related to Institute attendance or to having gone to the University of Hawaii's Graduate School of Library Studies. Perceptions of competence develop equally well in school and work settings.

2. Reflections Questionnaire Items combined with General Information Items.

   In order to pursue further the hypotheses derived from the obtained

data, selected comparisons were made combining items from the two instruments. Since it appears that to increase competence Institute Participants might prefer acquiring job skills, while persons who have never attended any institute might place more value on the learning of conceptual mastery, an item was included to allow this difference to appear in numerical form. Respondents were asked to indicate how they thought they might acquire the skills they need to become better librarians. No differences appear between Institute Participants and non-Participants. All persons heartily endorsed on-the-job-training, either alone or in combination with other avenues, as the best way to acquire additional professional competence. Additional Library School training to obtain needed skills was endorsed by only two persons out of the 64 respondents in this comparison.

3. The Course Expectations/Outcomes Questionnaire.

This questionnaire, consisting of 12 items on a 4-point scale, dealt with possible benefits to be derived from the sessions of the Institute. This Questionnaire was administered as an "Expectations Questionnaire" at the beginning of the Institute (August, 1971), and as an "Outcomes Questionnaire" at the conclusion of the Institute, (May, 1972). It was administered again as an Outcomes Questionnaire in November, 1972. Analyses of these data unfortunately are incomplete at the time of this writing. Initial arrays comparing group averages over the three administrations suggest however, that there are no remarkable differences, either from one administration to the next, or from one group of librarians to the next.

So far, this report has dealt primarily with numerical data reflecting changes during the Institute year. These changes seem to fit a general pattern not determined by the Institute alone but by several factors in the lives of respondents. Spontaneous comments in writing and from the interviews serve to put the general pattern into terms specific to training in librarianship. These comments also underscore the positive attitudes felt about last year's Institute.

In all the numerical, written and verbal data gathered there is not one severe criticism of the Institute or its staff from anyone.

b. Verbal Results

Written and verbal comments are organized around three major topics: the importance of the Institute to Participants, the importance of the Institute theme in the training of librarians, and specific recommendations for career preparation and continuing education in professional librarianship.

1. The Importance of the Institute to its Participants.

Briefly, the picture that emerges from written comments by questionnaire respondents and verbal comments by interviewees is composed primarily of three elements. First, the Institute was an important experience because it gave the participants a chance to meet other librarians in an intensive, exhausting series of sessions. Many of these sessions found a heterogeneous group of librarians talking together about a professional problem that they had in common. These sessions brought about changes in

self-concept. As one comment states it: "I became more accepting of my own weaknesses and of people who live by different values." Rather than striving alone for a professional identity and sense of direction that too often is an outgrowth of a misinterpreted graduate-school generalization, these librarians were realizing together that trying to identify themselves is rather futile in the din of the library. What they should be doing instead is trying to identify patrons and their library needs. Participants learned to go wading into unknown waters from each other and from the staff, (one participant responded that she learned "respect for the individual different that myself," as a "direct result of the example set by Dr. Haas.") As one participant put it, "it was a relief to learn there were others of like mind." Several participants said they gained self-assurance, in comments such as: "I am a little more relaxed when confronting people", "learned how to be comfortable when forcefulness is required", "Don't be afraid to try innovations", and "more confidence in understanding and working with other ethnic groups and people in general." Another participant summed up the way she learned it in this way: "Having a blend of working librarians and students of various ages gave an added dimension, proving that human values are more important than generation gaps. Communication gaps are hurdles which can be bridged."

The second major way in which the Institute continues to be held important is in the learning that took place regarding work with disadvantaged patrons. The knowledge gained of community resources, and of basic survey techniques to find out specifics about resources and needs, both received commendation. Many participants commented on the development of better communication with other people, including supervisors, teachers, pupils and students, patrons and non-patrons, and people from other community agencies. Although knowing the territory and feeling comfortable talking to a different kind of person are certainly aspects of working in disadvantaged and pluralistic communities, there is a disappointing lack of evidence in the spontaneous comments obtained that very many participants view their job in a cross-cultural perspective. Culture is at best a difficult concept to fathom, (hundreds of anthropological definitions of culture exist in print), and participants were able to experience under the supervision of the Institute only a few of its attendant manifestations. A process of understanding the importance of the cultural determinants of public dilemmas was only begun during the Institute.

The third major aspect of the Institute that is responded to by most participants is its practical format. Whether successful or not, the lightly supervised field work experiences received high praise. Almost all community projects chosen by participants went through significant revision as the vagaries of daily life unfolded. A handful of projects proved exceedingly successful, but more than one participant learned that "failure of a program can still provide a valuable lesson." The experiential nature of many Institute sessions facilitated the development of specific interpersonal skills simply by providing an accepting setting in which they could be shaped and practiced. Thus, while very few people still made spontaneous reference after six months to the specific experiential techniques used, (e.g., small group tasks,

role playing, and VTR feedback of ones own performance), there are many comments now that mention the kinds of specific skills that develop using an experiential approach. Among them are: "Ability to talk to people and be able to be more approachable", "Increased perception of how I appear to people". "Understanding a group and one-to-one dynamics", "Able to participate more effectively in discussions", and "Rates as one of the real privileges of my life. Great preparation--working in the field and seeing the community in its broadest aspects. Classes suffer in comparison--dry."

As will be discussed more thoroughly later, one of the two or three most frequently advanced recommendations regarding education in librarianship is that considerably more emphasis should be given to supervised practical experience. It didn't take Institute attendance to reach this recommendation. It comes from Controls and Supervisors as well as from Participants, and from Students as well as from Practitioners.

2. The Importance of the Institute Theme in the Preparation of Librarians.

It is a little difficult to assess the importance of the several themes of the Institute since they are defined in different ways by different people. For this discussion, three themes are defined: outreach activities, cultural determinism, and developing practical competence.

The outreach theme is the one that was most successfully developed during the Institute. As a result, spontaneous comments focused on such outcomes as: "I have come to the conclusion that in order to really meet the needs of the lower socio-economic groups in terms of the library, the library has to go to them. There is dire need of reform in the present library structure." The cross-cultural theme blends with the outreach theme in such comments as: "The Institute especially has made me aware of the necessity of getting to people what they need or want - not what the administration says is 'good'." All three themes are blended in the observation of this participant: "Many librarians have much talent, but lack the people skills to make any 'outreach' effective." The task of developing cross-cultural "people-skills" to conduct outreach programs can require some painful sacrifices. A participant waxes quite eloquent about this discomfort:

> "To be perfectly honest, I feel somewhat less comfortable with the role of librarian at the present time because as a result of the Institute I have tried to expand my scope of operation by stepping out of my familiar environment into the larger neighborhood community of disadvantaged people. Establishing friendly relations with an agency and through it making contact with people to provide them with a measure of library services is still a relatively new experience, requiring a period of orientation and adaptation. As I become more accustomed to this new role of mine, I believe I shall regain my confidence as a librarian."

The question remains concerning what types of professional library settings require that a librarian be conversant with the Institute themes. Outreach seems appropriate mainly for librarians in public libraries,

although school librarians also find themselves confronted with problems that might be solved through outreach activities. College librarians as well as public and school librarians, become involved in activities with cross-cultural themes. For instance, in the case of minority and foreign students, and for special culture-specific collections of materials (e.g., Hawaiiana, Japanese literature, etc.), an understanding of interactions between cultures can be used to great advantage. Finally, the usefulness of any library to essentially non-verbal or non-English-speaking patrons will depend upon the librarian developing practical skills in the use of non-verbal media as well as developing "people skills".

3. Specific Recommendations for Career Preparation and Continuing Education in Professional Librarianship.

Quite a number of specific - and sometimes conflicting - recommendations arose during the course of this follow up. After puzzling long and hard over a perspective into which to place these recommendations, it was found that a respondent from the follow-up sample would be able to do a better job:

> "Library school provided beginning guidelines. The U.S.O.E. institutes provided more practical information about the needs of communities. However, without inter-agency and community participation we librarians will continue to be primarily concerned about the library's image.
>
> "A need for training within our agencies - training to evaluate and plan budgets - programs, training to be better supervisors/managers and better able to work with members of our communities."

The national and local backdrop against which to view this person's perspective on librarianship is an austere one indeed. This year has brought a position-freeze in the State, and money for maintaining already developed library services has been cut back. Unemployment lines are dotted with librarians, many of them recent graduates filled with eagerness to try out their first professional exposure. Federal money is even more impossible to come by.

In addition, the rapid technological and social changes that are taking place definitely are affecting libraries in dramatic ways, whether librarians are prepared for these changes or not. Institutional obsolescence through underutilization and disinterest on the part of the public is more of a real threat than the threat of making the wrong choices for change. Such competitors as "leisure-learning centers" are beginning to pop up around the land. As one respondent pointed out, libraries are not often the topic of public debate or commentary. It is hard to find letters to newspaper editors about libraries. The public's disinterest in the crises confronting libraries must be counterbalanced by eye-catching, innovative and relevant programming from librarians themselves, developed in coordination with the work of other human services professionals, to appeal to a larger variety of patrons than has ever been considered before. Chances are,

this ultimately would mean a greater variety of specialized library programs, tailored to the unique needs and diverse aspirations of particular communities of potential patrons.

In terms of preparation for librarianship, the implication is that there must be a greater emphasis placed upon economical in-service training for the development of specific skills. Librarians should and must educate each other continually. As one respondent pointed out, "concerning the materials you work with, you learn 20% in graduate school and 80% on the job". Even such basic library skills as cataloguing, compiling and ordering take on a special complexion in a specific library.

Graduate schools should concentrate then on creating "generalist" librarians who are not only ready to tackle any of a number of special programming needs, but also are aware of a large selection of resources that can be called upon to help. From graduate school on, throughout the rest of a librarian's professional career, there should be monthly meetings, periodic workshops, conferences, institutes and other programs of training fitted in to the librarian's busy life. Library administrators need to recognize the importance of this training by allowing some proportion of work time for it. The largest number of respondents, Controls and Participants alike, voted for in-service training as the best way to obtain the skills they need. Professional associations also can do much to help, in bringing librarians together to discuss alternate solutions to common problems.

In order to orient students of library studies toward continual rather than terminal library education, and at the same time to provide them with a feel for what they're in for, there should be a period of at least a semester during graduate training spent working in one or more libraries. This supervised experience is recognized by a majority of respondents in this follow-up as one of the principle improvements that can be added to graduate school immediately. The model of the practice teaching experience required in education frequently is mentioned. Temporary exchanges of librarians among libraries can serve as an in-service equivalent of this practice-librarianship for students.

To prepare librarians to work effectively within the purview of today's libraries is a grossly shortsighted goal because these libraries are going to be different places tomorrow, both in the services provided and in the variety of patrons served. Libraries can no longer afford to be sanctuaries for a literate few. During the same time that literacy has increased in the U.S., the written word has been downgraded as a medium for information storage and exchange. Other media, notably audio and audo-visual recording, are still far from their zenith of development. Librarians must be prepared to meet the challenges of such changes, and not to try to maintain apparent constancies in today's unclear library image. The way to meet the challenges of change is to tune in precisely to those who ultimately guide most change: the reading - and also the non-reading - public. The best person to do the tuning in is the working librarian, and the librarian should know that he is the best even if he feels, as John Held, Jr. used to say about his own splendid woodcuts, "the best is none too good."

To get any more specific with the recommendations that can be derived from this follow-up, it is necessary to recognize the functional categories into which present-day libraries can be placed. Preparation in librarianship can be channeled into any of these categories without destruction of the "generalist" concept a librarian should maintain about himself. But the same generalist will be playing in a different ball park if he is in a college or professional library, a school library, a public library or in a community library. He may not even be employed, and still be able to make a contribution as a librarian, if he is prepared to try.

Just as it is appropriate for a working librarian to shape his library's services around needs expressed by patrons, and by other community agencies, it is appropriate for an educator to shape professional education and training around needs expressed by students and practitioners. This survey is inadequate to such a task. Some hints can be gleaned, but more substantial procedures would have to be used to take full advantage of what students and practitioners know.

There are some general categories of need that emerge from this follow-up. The examples under each came from Participants, Controls, and Supervisors as well.

Basic Library Skills:

- Compiling, cataloguing and ordering, especially regarding special collections, e.g., Hawaiiana and foreign language materials
- Information storage and retrieval systems
- Familiarity with resources and reference tools

Educational Technology:

- The media
- Audio-visual techniques and equipment maintenance
- Constructing posters, displays, exhibits
- Teaching skills for such tasks as instructing patrons and teachers in library use

Communication skills:

- Art of community and group contacting
- Publicity and fund-raising techniques
- Communications with patrons
- Group dynamics
- Report-writing-memos and evaluations

Library Administration:

- Program planning
- Planning for expanded facilities
- Budgeting and Accounting
- Supervisory and management skills
- Functions of community/school libraries
- Employee rights and collective bargaining

In conclusion, present career preparation and continuing education in librarianship can be enhanced by asking librarians what they want and need. Further, the process of education must be viewed as a long, lifetime proposition, and the central theme of all educational endeavors should be to prepare librarians for change. They will require flexibility, willingness to take risks, an optimistic outlook, and much greater awareness of their patrons in order to contribute to the process of change. Education must be experientially based, from a "practice-librarianship" in graduate school to various forms of in-service training.

The particular setting in which a librarian works certainly molds his activities. But over and above differences among settings the librarian must regard himself as a generalist, i.e., the best person available to carry out any of a whole variety of projects, whether he has encountered them before or not. The respondents in this study contributed a hint of how librarians might add to their own career preparation if they were in a position to do so.

SUMMARY

By way of overall summary, the constructive influence of the Institute will be felt in many ways by many people for years to come. The staff people directly responsible for its success, Dr. Joyce Haas and her assistant, Ms. Kay Kreamer, certainly were the best people for the job - even in the eyes of the most critical among the respondents.

Walter R. Jaeckle, Ph.D.
Box 856
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

(Participants)

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Graduate School of Library Studies

Dear

It is time for the final, six-month follow-up evaluation of the impact of the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies Institute for Training in Librarianship: "The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society." It will be especially helpful if you will fill out this final set of questionnaires so that we can base our evaluation on complete data for all participants.

Some of the items in these questionnaires may seem repetitious or strangely worded to you. That is because we are sending comparable questionnaires to quite different groups of people, and we had to make compromises in wording to assure some relevance to all respondents. Please try to answer all items.

Your responses will be held in strict confidence, and anonymity will be maintained. The University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies will receive only the final, tabulated results for the group as a whole.

Time is not on our side for this evaluation. Your responses can be useful only if you mail them back by November 30, 1972. If you would like to know some of the conclusions of this study, please write your name and address on a separate piece of paper and send it back with the questionnaires.

Thank you very much for your assistance in completing this study.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Jaeckle, Ph.D.
Evaluation Consultant

WRJ:km

Enclosures

(Supervisors)

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Graduate School of Library Studies

Dear

It is time for the final, six-month follow-up evaluation of the impact of the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies Institute for Training in Librarianship: "The Librarian in a Pluralistic Society." It will be especially helpful if you will fill out the enclosed questionnaires regarding who participated in the Institute, so that we can base our evluation on complete data for all participants.

Some of the items in these questionnaires may seem repetitious or strangely worded to you. That is because we are sending comparable questionnaires to quite different groups of people, and we had to make compromises in wording to assure some relevance to all respondents. Please try to answer all items.

Your responses will be held in strict confidence and anonymity will be maintained. The University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies will receive only the final, tabulated results for the group as a whole.

Time is not on our side for this evaluation. Your responses can be useful only if you mail them back by November 30, 1972. If you would like to know some of the conclusions of this study, please write your name and address on a separate piece of paper and send it back with your questionnaires.

Thank you very much for your assistance in completing this study.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Jaeckle, Ph.D.
Evaluation Consultant

WRJ:km

Enclosures

(Controls)

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Graduate School of Library Studies

Dear

You have been selected to participate in a study of library education that is being conducted by the Cross-Cultural Center, Inc., for the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies. This research is a part of the Institute for Training in Librarianship conducted at the University of Hawaii during the past year. Your cooperation would be appreciated greatly, because you can be helpful in formulating future programs for training librarians.

Please answer the enclosed questionnaires to indicate as best as possible the effect of your last year's work or library-school experiences on your personal and professional development. Some of the items in these questionnaires may seem strangely worded to you. That is because we are sending comparable questionnaires to quite different groups of people, and we had to make compromises in wording to assure some relevance to all respondents. Please try to answer all items.

Your responses will be held in strict confidence, and anonymity will be maintained. The University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies will receive only the final, tabulated results for the group as a whole.

Time is not on our side for this evaluation. Your responses can be used only if you mail them back by November 30, 1972. If you would like to know some of the conclusions of this study, please write your name and address on a separate piece of paper and send it back with the questionnaires.

Thank you very much for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Walter R. Jaeckle, Ph.D.
Evaluation Consultant

WRJ:km

Enclosures

(Participants) Code ___

REFLECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. As a result of the Institute, I:

	Much More	Somewhat More	No Change	Somewhat Less	Much Less
1. consider it important to think of myself and others as products of our respective cultures	—	—	~	—	~
2. am comfortable with the role of librarian	—	—	~	—	~
3. am aware of ways libraries can cooperate with other agencies in social action programs	—	—	~	—	~
4. have self-confidence about relating to people of other socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds	—	—	~	—	~
5. set professional goals for myself which I fully intend to achieve	—	—	~	—	~
6. am aware of the problems and conflicts involved in community and library planning	—	—	~	—	~
7. feel competent to carry out a library program in a disadvantaged neighborhood	—	—	~	—	~
8. am aware of what differences exist among ethnic groups in the U.S.	—	—	~	—	~
9. am observant of human behavior as a guide to how to respond	—	—	~	—	~
10. see my own activities in light of the development of U.S. libraries and U.S. society	—	—	~	—	~

Code ___

B. As a result of the Institute:

1. What particular skills did you gain that are helpful to you as a librarian?

1. ___
2. ___
3. ___
4. ___

2. What particular skills do you still need to acquire to perform better as a librarian?

1. ___
2. ___
3. ___
4. ___

3. How do you think you could best acquire any skills that you still may need?

1. Library school training ___
2. On-the-job training ___
3. On my own ___
4. Some other way (Please describe) ___

C. 1. As compared to other librarians you know, how would you rate your present potential to contribute to the library profession?

___ among the top 25% of librarians
___ in the 50% to 75% range
___ in the 25% to 50% range
___ among the bottom 25%

2. Any comments about his performance:

D. Any other comments:

(Supervisors) Code ____

REFLECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. As a result of the Institute; _____:

	Much More	Somewhat More	No Change	Somewhat Less	Much Less
1. considers it important to think of himself and others as products of their respective cultures	___	___	~	___	___
2. is comfortable with the role of librarian	___	___	~	___	___
3. is aware of ways libraries can cooperate with other agencies in social action programs	___	___	~	___	___
4. has self-confidence about relating to people of other socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds	___	___	~	___	___
5. sets professional goals for himself which he fully intends to achieve	___	___	~	___	___
6. is aware of the problems and conflicts involved in community and library planning	___	___	~	___	___
7. feels competent to carry out a library program in a disadvantaged neighborhood	___	___	~	___	___
8. is aware of what differences exist among ethnic groups in the U.S.	___	___	~	___	___
9. is observant of human behavior as a guide to how to respond	___	___	~	___	___
10. sees his own activities in light of the development of U.S. libraries and U.S. society	___	___	~	___	___

Code ____

B. As a result of the Institute:

1. What particular skills did the participant gain that are helpful to him as a librarian?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____
4. ____

2. What particular skills does the participant still need to acquire to perform better as a librarian?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____
4. ____

3. How do you think he could best acquire any skills that he still may need?

1. Library school training ____
2. On-the-job training ____
3. On his own ____
   Some other way (Please describe) ____

C. 1. As compared to other librarians you know, how would you rate his present potential to contribute to the library profession?

____ among the top 25% of librarians
____ in the 50% to 75% range
____ in the 25% to 50% range
____ among the bottom 25% of librarians

2. Any comments about his performance:

D. Any other comments:

(Controls) Code ___

REFLECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. As a result of my experiences during the last year, I:

		Much More	Somewhat More	No Change	Somewhat Less	Much Less
1.	consider it important to think of myself and others as products of our respective cultures	___	___	___	___	___
2.	am comfortable with the role of librarian	___	___	___	___	___
3.	am aware of ways libraries can cooperate with other agencies in education programs	___	___	___	___	___
4.	have confidence about relating to people of other socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds	___	___	___	___	___
5.	set personal goals for myself which I fully intend to achieve	___	___	___	___	___
6.	am aware of the problems and conflicts involved in community and library planning	___	___	___	___	___
7.	feel competent to carry out a library program in a disadvantaged neighborhood	___	___	___	___	___
8.	am aware of what differences exist among ethnic groups in the U.S.	___	___	___	___	___
9.	am observant of human behavior as a guide to how to respond	___	___	___	___	___
10.	see my own activities in light of the development of U.S. libraries and U.S. society	___	___	___	___	___

Code _____

B. During the last year:

1. What particular skills did you gain that are helpful to you as a librarian?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

2. What particular skills do you still need to acquire to perform better as a librarian?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

3. How do you think you could best acquire any skills that you still may need?

1. Library school training _____
2. On-the-job training _____
3. On my own _____
4. Some other way (Please describe) _____

C. 1. As compared to other librarians you know, how would you rate your present potential to contribute to the library profession?

_____ among the top 25% of librarians
_____ in the 50% to 75% range
_____ in the 25% to 50% range
_____ among the bottom 25% of librarians

2. Any comments about your performance:

D. Any other comments:

(Participants)

Code _____

OUTCOMES OF THE COURSE EXPERIENCE

My overall knowledge of the subject increased.	___	___	___	___	I haven't gained any new knowledge of the subject.
I learned about the interrelationships of facts and ideas.	___	___	___	___	I see no practical applications of the subject matter.
I gained in self-confidence.	___	___	___	___	I didn't change in my sense of self-confidence.
I gained in my understanding of other people.	___	___	___	___	My understanding of others hasn't changed.
I derived social satisfaction from this course.	___	___	___	___	I did not derive social satisfaction from this course.
I would advise a friend to enroll in the course next semester.	___	___	___	___	I would advise a friend not to enroll in the course next semester.
I learned to think about questions and analyze problems for myself.	___	___	___	___	The course didn't help me think questions through or analyze problems for myself.
I improved in my ability to take part in group discussions.	___	___	___	___	I did not improve in my ability to take part in group discussions.
I have been stimulated to strive for excellence in my own communication.	___	___	___	___	I have not changed in my striving for excellence in my own communication.
I think I have clarified my values as a result of this course.	___	___	___	___	Clarification of my values has nothing to do with this course.
I'm satisfied with the way things went in the course.	___	___	___	___	I'm dissatisfied with the way things went in the course.
I gained practical "know-how" for a job.	___	___	___	___	I did not gain practical "know-how" for a job.

(Supervisors)

Code ____

OUTCOMES OF THE COURSE EXPERIENCE

His overall knowledge of the subject increased.	____	____	____	____	He hasn't gained any new knowledge of the subject.
He learned about the interrelationships of facts and ideas.	____	____	____	____	He sees no practical applications of the subject matter.
He gained in self-confidence.	____	____	____	____	He didn't change in his sense of self-confidence.
He gained in his understanding of other people.	____	____	____	____	His understanding of others hasn't changed.
He derived social satisfaction from this course.	____	____	____	____	He did not derive social satisfaction from this course.
I would advise another employee to enroll in the course next semester.	____	____	____	____	I would advise another employee not to enroll in the course next semester.
He learned to think about about questions and analyze problems for himself.	____	____	____	____	The course didn't help him think questions through or analyze problems for himself.
He improved in his ability to take part in group discussions.	____	____	____	____	He did not improve in his ability to take part in group discussions.
He has been stimulated to strive for excellence in his own communication.	____	____	____	____	He has not changed in his striving for excellence in his own communication.
He has clarified his values as a result of this course.	____	____	____	____	Clarification of his values has nothing to do with this course.
He's satisfied with the way things went in the course.	____	____	____	____	He's dissatisfied with the way things went in the course
He gained practical "know-how" for a job.	____	____	____	____	He did not gain practical "know-how" for a job.

(Participants & Controls) Code _____

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Highest degree or certificate received in Library Studies _____

   From what institution? _____

   In what month and year? _____

2. Have you ever been enrolled in the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies? Yes _____, No _____.

3. Have you ever attended any U.S. Office of Education Institutes?

   Yes _____ No_____.

   How many? _____.

   When was the most recent one? _____

   Have you attended such an institute in Hawaii? Yes _____, No _____.

   Would you like to attend such an institute in Hawaii? Yes _____, No _____.

4. Are you currently working as a librarian? Yes _____, No _____.

   If so, are you working Full time? _____

   Part-time? _____, _____ hrs/wk.

5. How well do you feel your total library education (including classes in any library school and participation in any U.S.O.E. institute), has prepared you to view a library in terms of the needs of its particular community of potential patrons?

   Comment:

APPENDIX D

SELECTED EVALUATION DATA

Hawaii Educational Affects Project Survey-Significant Changes in Before-After Scores

Course Expectations and Course Outcomes Surveys-Table of Mean Scores for All Questions on Three Surveys

Follow-Up Reflections Survey-Table of Mean Scores for Participants, Supervisors, and Controls

Hawaii Educational Affects Project Survey

Significant Changes in Before-After Scores[1]

A. Political Orientations[2]

5. For each of the following kinds of people, please indicate whether you would permit or prohibit such a person from teaching in a public high school.

(1/47) d. A Black Panther. . . . .

x=0 p=.004

Before \ After	Prohibit	Permit
Permit	0	11
Prohibit	9	8

(1/48) e. A member of the John Birch society. . . . .

x=1 p=.035

Before \ After	Prohibit	Permit
Permit	1	15
Prohibit	7	7

8. How do you feel about the domestic and international competition between capitalism and socialism as alternate forms of economic organization in the United States and in other countries of the world?

---

[1]For discussion, see Chapter II above, pp 16-17.

[2]Hawaii Educational Affects Project; Earl R. Babbie, Director. Honolulu, University of Hawaii, Survey Research Office, 1970.

(1/65) d. Which form of economic organization, if any, do you think the United States should work to maintain or establish in other countries?

1. Capitalism
2. Socialism
3. Mixture of capitalism and socialism
4. Different forms for different countries
5. Shouldn't work for any form in other countries
6. No opinion

x=0 p=.016

	(5-6) Don't Know (what's good for others)	(1-4) Know (what's good for others)
(1-4) Know	6	4
(5-6) Don't Know	20	0

10. There has been much debate over student protests which involve the breaking of laws. While all such acts are technically illegal, many students have argued that some are "legitimate" forms of protest if other methods of protest have failed. Beside each of the protest situations listed below, please indicate whether you feel:

(a) it is <u>not</u> a legitimate form of protest
(b) it is a legitimate form of protest only if the protester is willing to accept punishment for breaking the law.
(c) it is a legitimate form of protest even if the protester will <u>not</u> accept punishment willingly.

(1/69) b. Occupying a University office to protest University policies. . . . .

x=0 p=.001

Before	After (a) Not Legitimate	After (b-c) Legitimate
(b-c) Legitimate	0	15
(a) Not Legitimate	6	10

(1/70) c. Occupying a University office to protest national foreign policy. . . . .

x=3 p=.046

Before (a) Not Legitimate	After (a) Not Legitimate	After (b-c) Legitimate
Before (b-c) Legitimate	3	4
Before (a) Not Legitimate	13	10

(1/74) e. Destruction of property. . . . .

x=0 p=.031

Before (a) Not Legitimate	After (a) Not Legitimate	After (b-c) Legitimate
Before (b-c) Legitimate	0	1
Before (a) Not Legitimate	23	5

B. Social Orientations

2. Beside each of the statements listed below, please indicate whether you believe the statement is true or false, or whether you are not sure.

T F NS

(2/16) a. People who use marijuana regularly over a long period of time will start craving heroin. . . . .

x=1 p=.020

Before	After Not Sure	After Sure (T+F)
Sure (T+F)	1	17
Not Sure	4	8

3. For each of the racial/ethnic groups listed below, please indicate whether you have ever dated anyone from that group. If you have not dated anyone from a given group, please indicate whether you might date someone from that group if the situation arose. (If you are engaged or married, please answer as if you were single.)

(3/27) Have you ever dated? Yes	No	(3/34) IF NO: Do you think you might? Yes	No

(3/34) g. Negro, Black. . . . .

x=0 p=.02

Before \ After	No	Yes
Yes	0	8
No	5	7

5. Beside each of the statements listed below, please indicate whether you agree or disagree, or whether you are not sure.

(5/48) e. In some families, the woman should work, and the man should take care of the house. . . . .

x=1 p=.011

Before \ After	Disagree	Agree
Agree	1	19
Disagree	1	9

6. People often disagree over who is to blame for various social problems in American society. Some say that the individual persons involved are wholly to blame, others say the society is wholly to blame, and still others say both the individual and society share in the blame.

For each of the social problems listed below, please indicate where you would generally place the blame. (If you feel the individual is wholly to blame, check the 1 box; check the 6 box if you feel society is wholly to blame, or indicate the relative mixture of the two by checking one of the boxes in between.)

Individual----------Society
1 2 3 4 5 6

(2/49) a. Poverty. . . . .

N = 17 T = 19.5 p = .01

Before $\bar{X}$ = 3.9
After $\bar{X}$ = 4.5

8. Students are always being graded for what they do. Now we would like to turn this process around and ask you to give letter grades to some of the major institutions of American society.

(2/76) j. The Democratic party. . . . .

(5) A (4) B (3) C (2) D (1) F

N = 16 T = 22.5 p = .02

Before $\bar{X}$ = 3.1 (C+)
After $\bar{X}$ = 2.7 (C-)

E. Personal (self) Orientations

2. Listed below are some very basic questions about life. Beside each please indicate whether you have arrived at an answer which you feel will be satisfactory to you throughout your life. If you do not now have such an answer, do you feel you will arrive at such an answer during your life time?

	(3/70) Do you have an answer now?	(3/76) IF NO: Do you think you will find an answer?
	Yes No	Yes Maybe No

(3/70) e. The proper social roles for men and women. . . . .

x=0 p=.002

Before \ After	No	Yes
Yes	9	12
No	10	0

Course Expectations and Course Outcomes Surveys-Table of Mean Scores

PARTICIPANTS

OUTCOMES	College			Public			School			Student		
	E	O_1	O_2	E	O_1	O_2	E	O_1	O_2	E	O_1	O_2
1. Increase overall knowledge	3.50	4.00	3.0	3.83	3.67	3.4	3.80	3.64	3.40	3.80	3.60	4.00
2. Interrelationships of facts and ideas	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.50	3.17	3.2	3.90	3.36	3.20	3.60	3.30	3.50
3. Self-Confidence	3.50	3.25	3.0	3.66	3.17	2.6	3.45	3.45	3.40	3.40	3.50	3.88
4. Understanding of other people	3.75	4.00	3.0	3.83	3.33	3.4	3.90	3.36	3.0	3.90	3.80	3.50
5. Social satisfaction	3.50		3.25	3.33		2.8	3.18		3.50	2.60		3.38
6. Advise a friend to take the course		3.75	3.75		4.00	3.6		3.82	3.70		4.00	4.00
7. Think about questions and analyze problems	3.50	2.75	3.0	3.67	3.33	2.4	3.80	3.45	3.10	3.80	3.30	3.38
8. Improve ability in group discussions	3.00	3.00	3.0	3.33	3.00	2.2	3.56	3.00	3.10	3.0	3.30	3.63
9. Strive for excellence in communication	4.00	3.50	3.25	4.00	3.83	3.0	3.80	3.82	3.20	3.70	3.40	3.75
10. Clarify values	3.25	3.00	3.0	3.83	3.33	2.8	3.80	3.45	3.20	3.50	3.50	3.63
11. Be satisfied	3.25	3.00	3.0	3.00	3.50	3.2	3.27	3.64	3.40	3.40	3.20	3.50
12. Practical "know-how" for a job	4.00	2.50	3.75	2.67	2.83	2.6	3.45	3.27	2.50	3.40	3.0	2.88

E = Expectations Survey - August '71
O_1 = Outcomes Survey - May '72
O_2 = Outcomes Survey - November '72

Course Expectations and Course Outcomes Surveys-Table of Mean Scores

SUPERVISORS

OUTCOMES	College			Public			School		
	E	O_1	O_2	E	O_1	O_2	E	O_1	O_2
1. Increase overall know-ledge	3.75	4.0	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.0	3.90	3.20	3.14
2. Interrelationships of facts and ideas	3.25	4.0	4.00	3.66	3.50	3.0	2.90	3.40	2.86
3. Self-Confidence	2.75	3.50	4.00	3.83	3.50	3.0	3.45	3.20	3.00
4. Understanding of other people		3.50	4.00		3.67	3.20	3.72	3.60	3.0
5. Social satisfaction	2.0		4.00	3.5		3.66	3.27		3.91
6. Advise a friend to take the course		4.0	4.00		3.33	3.40		3.20	3.29
7. Think about questions and analyze problems	3.50	3.0	4.00	3.83	3.17	2.80	3.72	3.20	3.14
8. Improve ability in group discussions	3.00	3.5	4.00	2.66	3.67	3.20	3.27	3.20	3.0
9. Strive for excellence in communication	3.90	2.0	4.00	3.16	3.67	3.40	3.00	3.40	3.57
10. Clarify values	3.75	3.5	4.00	3.66	3.83	3.40	3.75	3.40	2.71
11. Be satisfied	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	3.40	2.81	3.25	3.43
12. Practical "know-how" for a job	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.83	3.17	2.60	3.63	3.20	3.16

E = Expectations Survey - August '71
O_1 = Outcomes Survey - May '72
O_2 = Outcomes Survey - November '72

Reflections	CONTROLS						SUPERVISORS				PARTICIPANTS					
	Coll	Pub	School	Tot	Stud	Tot	Coll	Pub	School	Tot	Coll	Pub	School	Tot	Stud	Tot
1.	4.00	3.50	3.45	3.52	3.92	3.67	3.5	4.40	4.11	4.19	4.75	4.20	4.30	4.37	4.63	4.44
2.	3.50	3.50	3.45	3.48	4.36	3.81	3.5	4.00	4.62	4.00	2.75	3.60	3.90	3.58	4.25	3.78
3.	3.50	4.30	3.55	3.87	4.14	3.97	4.0	4.80	4.62	4.60	4.75	4.80	4.30	4.53	4.50	4.52
4.	4.00	3.70	3.64	3.70	3.59	3.65	3.5	4.40	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.0	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.15
5.	3.50	3.20	3.55	3.39	4.00	3.61	3.5	4.20	4.11	4.06	4.25	3.6	4.40	4.16	4.13	4.15
6.	3.50	4.20	3.45	3.78	3.29	3.89	3.5	4.60	4.37	4.33	4.75	4.6	4.50	4.58	4.13	4.44
7.	3.00	3.10	3.00	3.04	3.43	3.19	3.5	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.50	3.8	4.00	4.05	4.25	4.11
8.	4.00	3.60	3.55	3.61	3.64	3.62	3.5	4.60	4.33	4.31	4.75	4.20	4.10	4.26	4.38	4.30
9.	4.00	3.50	3.55	3.57	3.43	3.51	4.0	4.40	4.11	4.19	4.25	4.20	4.10	4.16	4.25	4.19
10.	3.00	3.10	3.18	3.13	3.29	3.19	4.0	4.40	3.83	4.08	4.5	4.0	4.00	4.11	3.63	3.96

Follow-Up Reflections Survey - Table of Mean Scores[1]

[1] For questionnaire format, see next page

REFLECTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

A. As a result of the Institute my experiences during the last year, I:

		Much More	Somewhat More	No Change	Somewhat Less	Much Less
1.	consider it important to think of myself and others as products of our respective cultures	___	___	___	___	___
2.	am comfortable with the role of librarian	___	___	___	___	___
3.	am aware of ways libraries can cooperate with other agencies in social action programs	___	___	___	___	___
4.	have self-confidence about relating to people of other socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds	___	___	___	___	___
5.	set professional goals for myself which I fully intend to achieve	___	___	___	___	___
6.	am aware of the problems and conflicts involved in community and library planning	___	___	___	___	___
7.	feel competent to carry out a library program in a disadvantaged neighborhood	___	___	___	___	___
8.	am aware of what differences exist among ethnic groups in the U.S.	___	___	___	___	___
9.	am observant of human behavior as a guide to how to respond	___	___	___	___	___
10.	see my activities in light of the development of U.S. cities and U.S. society	___	___	___	___	___

APPENDIX E

EXHIBITS

Exhibits - Contents

A. Selected Program Materials

1. Publicity Brochure
2. Recruitment Letter - Practitioners
3. Recruitment Letter - Students
4. Application for Admission
5. Memo to Institute Participants - August, 1971
6. Term Projects - Fall Semester
7. Memo to Institute Participants - January, 1972
8. Field Experiences/Term Projects - Spring Semester
9. Certificate of Completion

B. Evaluation Materials[1]

1. Memo from Dr. Gerald Meredith re: I.D. Number
2. Background Questionnaire
3. Hawaii Educational Affects Project (HEAP) Survey
4. Course Expectations
5. Course Expectations - Supervisors
6. Suggested Participant Evaluation System
7. Weekly Feedback Slips (a)speaker b)discussion)
8. First Semester Feedback Survey
9. Second Semester Feedback Survey

---

[1]For Six-Month Follow-Up Evaluation Materials, See Appendix C

10. Outcomes of the Course Experience

11. Memo from Dr. Gerald Meredith to Supervisors

12. Outcomes of the Course Experience - Supervisors

13. Impact of Instructor on Student and Course

14. Narrative Evaluation

15. Field Experience - Participant Feedback

16. Letter to Field Work Agency Personnel

17. Field Experience - Agency Feedback

C. Publications

1. "Some Agencies, Programs, Etc. Related to the 'War on Poverty'"
   -- K. Kreamer and W. Ishimoto.

2. "Adult Basic Education - An Annotated Bibliography."
   -- S. Tanioka.

3. "Institute Newsletter - November, 1972."
   -- S. Mitchell.

4. "ALA Conference Reports."
   -- V. Manoi, E. Mori and S. Lindley.

EXHIBITS

Exhibits are not included in this copy of the Narrative Evaluation Report but are available at the University of Hawaii Graduate School of Library Studies.